PRINCIPAL PERCEIVED PREPAREDNESS TO LEAD THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMON CORE

A dissertation presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of
Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

By

William Hoffman

Director: Dr. Kathleen Topolka-Jorissen
Associate Professor
Department of Human Services

Committee Members:
Dr. Jamie Vaske, Department of Criminal Justice
Dr. Kim Elliott, Associate Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, North Carolina

October 16, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my family. My lovely wife, Carrie Lee, spent endless hours at home with the kids while I attended classes and wrote the dissertation. Thank you so much for your patience as you put up with me in what I am sure has seemed like a never ending project. I would not have completed this project without you. I love you. I also want to thank my daughters, Camille, Maya, and Ella for simply being the most beautiful girls a father could hope for. I love you all so much.

Also, to my professors and colleagues at Western Carolina University who have given me guidance and direction during this endeavor. In particular, I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Kathleen Jorrisen, who provided her input and wisdom throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr. Jamie Vaske and Dr. Kim Elliott for serving on my dissertation committee and for providing meaningful insight in the development and fulfillment of this study.

I want to thank Dr. Ron Wilcox, Superintendent of Madison County Schools, for his kindness and generosity during this process. Thank you for always encouraging me to spend time with my family and always reminding me that while you missed opportunities to spend time with your family in your professional life, I should never forget to take time with mine.

To Mom and Dad and Lee who have given me a sense of hope and perseverance, and the opportunity to work hard and see a project like this through. No son could love his parents more. Dad, it is hard to believe you have been gone now for almost 20 years. I

can’t wait to take your old name plate out of the storage room and proudly put it on my desk.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

ABSTRACT

PRINCIPAL PERCEIVED PREPAREDNESS TO LEAD THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMON CORE

William Hoffman, Ed.D

Western Carolina University (October 2013)

Director: Dr. Kathleen Topolka-Jorissen

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals regarding their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards in their schools. Specifically, this study was designed to determine the following: (a) how do principals from across North Carolina perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards? (b) what are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards? The design of this study followed closely the design of Keith (2008) when she conducted a similar survey of Virginia principals as to their desire for professional development in meeting the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. Each North Carolina principal was surveyed on a voluntary basis and all principals who responded were included in the study. The major finding of the study was that in the survey's 26 efficacy statements significant relationships were found between demographic question 10: Number of hours of training in Common Core (Instruction, Pedagogy, Revised Blooms Taxonomy) and 23 of the efficacy statements (See Appendix A). When statements of efficacy were ranked, principals said that efficacy statement 26, Satisfaction with Common Core training I have received from outside of my district,

represented an area of least efficacy. Furthermore, support received from district office regarding financial support, professional development, response to concerns, Common Core training and communication were all areas that ranked low for principals with regard to support from their district offices.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

A free education has long been considered an essential part of the common good and a central pillar of our democracy. To understand the dilemma facing principals in leading change in today's educational setting, it is important that the reader have some understanding of the current public school context. Public education is predicated on the notion that an education is beneficial to all citizens of a community. Furthermore, North Carolina law mandates that each citizen has a fundamental right to a free education as stated in Article IX section 2 of the North Carolina Constitution:

> The General Assembly shall provide by taxation and otherwise for a general and uniform system of free public schools, which shall be maintained at least nine months in every year, and wherein equal opportunities shall be provided for all students. (p.403)

This law mandates that public education in North Carolina shall be free and provide equal opportunity.

However, education is not free from cost and cuts in funding. The North Carolina General Assembly made deep cuts in public school expenditures in 2012-2013 which has had a negative impact on the instructional program that public schools can provide. Further federal cuts to programs such as Head Start are anticipated in the 2013-2014 school year. Similar cuts have been seen by governors who seek to equate teachers with big government expenses and higher taxes. Rarely do people hear stories of the powerful impact teachers have on students, or the positive impact that public schools have had on

people who live in poverty. With the loss of personnel and resources that result from these budget cuts, principals are seeking ways to stretch their budgets to maintain high student achievement and a positive school climate.

School leaders are charged with casting the vision for developing a positive organizational culture in their schools and positively leading with confidence even in difficult economic times. To lead complex systems today requires collaboration. For example, Hallinger and Heck (1998) pointed to the need for principals to develop collaborative relationships with people within schools. Another important function of the principal is supporting a positive organizational climate which relates to the perceptions of the organization people inside and outside the organization might have (Owens & Valesky, 2007). Organizational climate includes the culture, the organizational structure, the ecology of the organization, and the milieu. The culture of an organization tells a great deal about how the organization operates, its effectiveness and how it deals with change: According to Owens and Valesky (2007), "Studies of schools have strongly supported the belief that organizational culture is a fundamental factor in determining the quality of educational organizations" (p.220). Principals need the capacity to lead change in their schools, and a positive organizational culture supports the framework that principals need to implement initiatives and carry out their responsibilities.

While school leaders understand the importance of creating a positive professional school culture, they face many obstacles such as cutting personnel and resources such as instructional supply materials and textbooks have been cut by 50% and 70% respectively. In North Carolina, teachers have not received a pay raise between 2007 and 2013. To put this in context, a sixth year teacher makes the same salary as a first year

teacher. Furthermore, teachers are graded and evaluated based on new Common Core and Essential Standards and assessments in each subject area. This has contributed to a decrease in teacher morale and a sense among faculty members that they are undervalued. Another factor that has affected school culture has been the diversion of scarce resources from traditional public schools to the implementation of vouchers to provide school choice and tax credits for families who would like to send their children to private or parochial schools. Clearly, the American educational system is at the center of a divisive public policy debate over the funding of public education. While the U.S. public education system is consistently scrutinized in comparison with countries from around the world, sequestration in federal programs such as Exceptional Children, Title I and Title II were cut by ten percent in 2013. Under the guise of fully funding schools, local school districts in North Carolina have been forced to return tens of millions of dollars back to the State over the past decade. In addition to declining resources, schools also contend with increasing mandates for accountability. As resources are cut annually, under current legislation in North Carolina, each school will be given a grade of A, B, C, D, or F at the end of the 2014-2015 school year. This political and economic climate leaves public schools with higher class sizes, scarce resources, and low morale. Despite these challenges, principals are still expected to support teachers, implement state and federal mandates, develop positive professional cultures and lead sweeping program change.

One of the sweeping changes facing schools is the implementation of the Common Core Standards. The Common Core Standards began in 2009, and since then have been endorsed by the U.S Department of Education. The Common Core Standards have been adopted by 45 states, including North Carolina. The National Governors'

Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers supported this initiative. Nationally, and across North Carolina as a result of Race to the Top, teams of teachers have been gathering to transition to the new Common Core Standards in Mathematics and English language Arts. According to Mathis (2010), the Common Core Standards have been established, because, according to Obama administration officials, "common standards are necessary for national economic competitiveness in a global community" (p.2). The curricular changes, brought about by the change in standards, have not only emphasized a shift in what is taught, but how it is taught. The Common Core emphasizes a strong focus on student engagement and requires students to attain a deeper understanding of informational text. The Common Core classroom encourages students to work in collaborative teams, investigating and analyzing topics in small groups. Furthermore, as opposed to covering a wide range of topics in math, teachers build a deeper, conceptual understanding of core content which builds from year to year. The pedagogy behind the new standards emphasizes constructivist learning, with the teacher acting as a facilitator rather than a lecturer.

This change represents and emphasizes a shift in teaching, and the principal is expected to play a key role in the implementation of this change at the school level. The principal is responsible for serving both as the instructional leader in his or her school as well as the organizational manager who must bridge the divide between district, state, and federal initiatives and the classroom. Furthermore, principals must understand the shifts in curriculum in order to monitor instruction effectively and meet the demands of leading change in their schools while facing a reduction in much needed resources due to reduced budgets. For example, many North Carolina principals have had to reduce the

numbers of teachers and teacher assistants, instructional supply budgets, and assistant principals over the past decade. This has occurred in conjunction with higher rates of poverty in North Carolina districts and reduced opportunity to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of struggling students.

Despite the challenges of implementing the Common Core, principal leadership is essential if classroom teachers are to implement changes such as using more informational text, persisting through text and increased rigor in instruction that are geared to increase success for all students. It is unknown, however, how prepared principals are to meet these challenges. Without the leadership of the principal in this national initiative this change will not occur at the classroom level. In seeking to understand the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals with regard to leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards, this research addressed the following primary research question: Are principals prepared to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards in North Carolina? This research study focused on determining whether principals in North Carolina are prepared to lead the implementation of the Common Core standards and determine in which areas principals feel strong preparedness to lead and in which areas do they feel a lack of preparedness to lead. This study fills a gap in the existing literature regarding the professional development support for principals to lead change in their schools, the level and types of professional development needed by principals, and the support that principals receive from district offices to lead change.

Rationale

With the implementation of the Common Core Standards school leaders will need the capacity to support teachers, understand the new curriculum shifts, promote student learning in a new learning environment, and empower teachers to deliver high quality instruction across each classroom resulting in the transformation of schools (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe & Meyerson, 2005). Public school principals should be and often are the alpha and the omega of their schools and their efforts to sustain shared goals within a school community have a great impact on student achievement (Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Silins, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1991). Principals are in charge of hiring personnel, establishing budgets, monitoring instruction, scheduling buses, maintaining discipline, running the cafeteria, providing homeless services, serving homebound students, overseeing Individual Education Plans, maintaining the facility, or as Cohen (2001) noted the "demands" that principals have always faced. But it is unknown whether principals receive the proper professional development to handle all of their professional responsibilities. There is little research to assess the levels and effectiveness of professional development for principals. Grissom and Harrington (2010) argued that without a strong basis for understanding the skills and abilities needed to be a successful principal, it has been difficult to provide the needed professional development support for them. Youngs and King (2002) suggested that on rare occasions has the research connected principal leadership and professional development and linked them to influencing instructional quality at the school level. According to the literature, the framework and content for the professional development for school leaders has not been fully developed or conceptualized.

An additional aspect that plays into successful school leadership is efficacy in that one of the most important criteria for effective leadership is the belief that one has the ability to provide leadership. Bandura (1997) asserted that self/collective efficacy theory pertains to a person's beliefs about his/her own ability to control aspects of his/her professional life. Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Andersen, and Wahlstrom (2004) suggested that without the training necessary to lead the school in its many functions, the self-efficacy, or the belief about one's own ability to make a difference or to have an impact, can become mitigated in school leaders. This is especially true if they are not given the proper training to provide that leadership for their personnel. Previous research demonstrates that self-efficacy is a critical ingredient in school leadership, yet not all principals have this belief in themselves (McCormick, 2001; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Thus, the literature suggests that if school leaders question their own ability to lead their schools, they may not be ready to create the culture of continuous learning in their schools necessary to meet the needs of twenty first century education.

Even before assuming the principalship, many principals enter the field inadequately prepared for the responsibilities of the position. Davis et al. (2005), in a study funded by the Wallace Foundation and Stanford University, found that the principalship is in a state of crisis due to two primary factors:

1. School districts are struggling to attract and retain an adequate supply of highly qualified candidates for leadership roles (Knapp, Copland & Talbert, 2003); and
2. Principal candidates and existing principals are often ill-prepared and inadequately supported to organize schools to improve learning while managing all of the other demands of the job (Young, 2002; Levine, 2005).

The authors also pointed to the lack of rigor in administrator preparation programs as a key factor in the lack of preparation of school administrators and further stated they may not be equipped for the "shifting role of the principal from manager to effective instructional leader" (Levine, 2005, p.4). Thus, according to the research, principals may need more training to meet the needs of students while overseeing the implementation of initiatives such as the Common Core.

That principals need to develop instructional leadership is apparent in the widespread appeals for their leadership roles in leading school improvement. Fahey (2011) in his analysis of leadership and professional community building pointed to the critical role that principals play in supporting professional learning communities and referenced the research of Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) and Levine, (2005) who suggested that principals are often not equipped to lead these efforts in their schools. Fahey (2011) suggested that principals are often expected to build a culture of learning in their school when they have not been supported by their district in how to develop such a community.

Many scholars advocate that more support be provided for principals, at least partially, in the form of appropriate leadership structures. Elmore (2000) indicated that the lack of professional development opportunities for principals is a question of the structure of school systems and relates to the poor management of our core function in education:

> The idea that people should acquire additional competencies over the course of their careers, that the organization should systematically invest in the improvement of these competencies, or, more controversially, that people should

> be expected to meet higher expectations for competence over the course of their careers-these expectations don't exist, or exist only weakly and idiosyncratically, in organizations that purport not to be able to manage their core functions. (p.8)

Elmore (2000) also pointed to the need for a new structure in school leadership where principals look to the core function of teaching and see their role as that of leading instructional improvement which requires "continuous learning" (p.20). This kind of initiative could tie to efforts to work collaboratively on "job embedded" activities within the school.

Principals may feel more efficacious in leading certain areas of their job than others depending on the amount of training they have had to lead in their role. Furthermore, principals with a high sense of self-efficacy are more likely to remain confident, or positive, when they have difficulty solving problems (Lyons & Murphy, 1994). According to Osterman and Sullivan (1996), by contrast, if principals do not have a heightened sense of self-efficacy they are likely to cast blame on others or become depressed and isolated in their role. In today's educational environment when initiatives are being implemented regularly, either on a state or federal level, principals need a high degree of efficacy as they approach their leadership positions.

With school reform mandates such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), accountability and the new Common Core Standards principals are expected to be the instructional leaders of mandates without having had adequate training or district support to lead these initiatives and impact student learning (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Further research is needed to better understand the relationship between school leadership and the competencies needed to implement the daily work of principals

(Neumerski, 2012). One aspect of the daily work of principals relates to instructional leadership and supporting the implementation of new standards across each content area. Ascertaining to what level principals perceive themselves as prepared to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards across North Carolina is a central focus of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-perceptions of principals' preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards across North Carolina. The analysis considered the adequacy of professional development for principals and, as Elmore (2000) stated: "the reciprocity of accountability" (p. 21). If districts expect principals to demonstrate competence in the principals' evaluation process, the district has an equal obligation to provide support. By identifying the factors that principals perceive as most important in leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards in North Carolina, this study may be able to provide the data that could enable the development of district policies to support principals in their leadership roles.

This study replicated a study by Keith (2008) who explored the perceptions of principals in Virginia regarding their readiness to lead the accountability changes mandated by No Child Left Behind. This study used the same efficacy statements as Keith (2008), but focused on the Common Core as opposed to No Child Left Behind. While the focus of this study was different from Keith's, the context of this study was similar, given the mandate to implement the Common Core Standards across the entire state and a great majority of the nation. This study sought to determine the level at which

North Carolina principals thought they were prepared to implement the Common Core Standards in their schools.

Research Questions

The design of this study was structured to answer the following research questions:

1. How do principals from across NC perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?
2. What are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?

Building on a previous study (Keith, 2008), the basic hypothesis behind this research was that North Carolina principals needed more professional development in order to effectively lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards in 2012-2013. Furthermore, this study provided an opportunity, at a critical time when the focus of each school leader was similar, to outline specific areas where principals need additional support. This feedback provided a framework for future professional development for principals across North Carolina.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is Bandura's self-efficacy model which is based on the theory that the sense of being able to make a difference and the belief in one's own ability (self-efficacy), or the ability of one's faculty and staff collectively (collective efficacy), is critical to achieving goals as a school leader (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Prussia, Anderson & Manz, 1998). Bandura (1996) furthermore asserted that self-efficacy is a key variable in leading change because of the self-confidence needed to

support the environment during the change process. To develop efficacy, school leaders need the opportunity to develop and refine the skills necessary to lead change.

Bandura (1977) outlined the four major sources of efficacy as performance accomplishment, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. The "mode of induction" for each of these sources includes, among other sources: participant modeling, performance exposure, live modeling, self-instruction, and attribution. This theory applies to school leaders due to the fact that schools can be high stress environments and principals need a heightened sense of self-efficacy in order to cope "The strength of people's convictions in their own effectiveness is likely to affect whether they will even try to cope with given situations." (p.193). A principal's self-efficacy beliefs are impacted by previous successes, and observed models of successful leadership in others through coaching or reflective feedback. These experiences shape the leader and the environment that the leader helps to create by providing models that they will improve if they persist in their efforts (Bandura, 1977, 1986).

According to Bandura (1977, 1986), two of the most promising approaches to decreasing defensive behavior on the part of individuals by modeling successful performance with clear outcomes to support efficacy and vicarious experience. In the school setting, this gives the principal a model and way for "seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences can generate expectations in observers that they too will improve if they intensify and persist in their efforts" (p.197). The literature is replete with examples of the need for consistent professional development experiences for principals that support efficacy sources, as outlined by

Bandura, through approaches such as collaborative inquiry and mentoring (Drago-Severson, 2007; Guskey, 1997; Smith, 2010).

Grissom and Harrington (2010), stated that the opportunities for professional development provided to teachers over principals is *many times larger*, which supports the notion that low self-efficacy among principals may be caused by the lack of professional development opportunities for principals.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) researched the impact of the efficacy beliefs of school leaders on student achievement. The researchers observed 96 principals and 2,764 teachers. The findings of the study showed the relationship between the efficacy of school leadership and student achievement. Another study by Leithwood and Mascall (2008) found that leadership efficacy resulted in gains in student achievement in the areas of math and language arts.

District support of principals is a key factor in their efficacy development. School leadership development will require district support in key areas such as the understanding of collaborative decision making, distributed leadership practice, and developing proficiency in the use of data analysis to support school improvement (Waters, et al., 2003; Jackson & Kelly, 2002). Methods such as mentoring and collaborative inquiry are activities that are supported by the literature and suggested as successful ways to support principals in their job requirements (Daresh, 2001; O'Neill, Fry, Hill & Bottoms 2005). Given the literature strongly supports the importance of self-efficacy among effective school leaders, this study examined the perceived efficacy of North Carolina school leaders regarding the implementation of the Common Core

standards in their schools, in the context of a national curricular and instructional change, and evaluated the preparedness of school leaders to lead this change.

Definition of Terms

Self-efficacy - As defined by Bandura (1994), perceived self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave.

Common Core Standards - Teachers, parents and community leaders have all weighed in to help create the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts. The standards clearly communicate what is expected of students at each grade level. This will allow our teachers to be better equipped to know exactly what they need to help students learn and establish individualized benchmarks for them. The Common Core State Standards focus on core conceptual understandings and procedures starting in the early grades, thus enabling teachers to take the time needed to teach core concepts and procedures well—and to give students the opportunity to master them (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices).

Academic Standards - Academic standards are public statements regarding what all students should know and be able to do in academic subjects: mathematics, science, English, history, geography, arts, and second languages.
(http://www.edtrust.org/node/133)

Preparedness - For the purpose of this study preparedness refers to the personal knowledge as a principal in North Carolina.

No Child Left Behind - The primary purpose of NCLB is to ensure that students in every public school achieve important learning goals while being educated in safe classrooms by well-prepared teachers. To increase student achievement, the law requires that school districts assume responsibility for all students reaching 100% student proficiency levels within 12 years on tests assessing important academic content. (http://www.education.com/reference/article/purpose-no-child-left-behind/)

Professional Development. Any professional learning activity that has the potential to enable teachers and principals to perform their work more effectively, including traditional services (e.g., workshops, institutes, university coursework) and informal learning opportunities (e.g., teacher or principal networks, study groups, mentoring, collaborative projects with colleagues, independent study) (Keith, 2008)

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

This study sought to gain insight from principals from across North Carolina as to their perceived preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. The sample of principals from across North Carolina who participated in the survey did not incorporate perceptions from all principals in North Carolina during the 2012-2013 school year. Failure of a majority of the principals surveyed to participate would limit generalization of the study's findings.

Another limitation of the study was the development of survey questions. The researcher hoped to gain insight into the self-perception of principals regarding their level of efficacy for implementing the Common Core Standards by exploring the factors

developed from the theoretical framework that contribute to efficacy. Therefore, other factors that may influence preparedness were not included and may limit findings.

As a researcher becomes more knowledgeable, he becomes more selective, focusing on those areas of the study he best understands. His interpretation of the study results, therefore, must be recognized as one of many points of view from which the data might be examined. The focus of this study, therefore, reflects this researcher's perspectives.

The subjects are limited to principals from across North Carolina employed during the 2012-2013 school year. Their self-perceptions may not be consistent with those of other principals.

Delimitations

A study of the areas for which principals feel prepared and unprepared to lead seems to be of central importance in the implementation of the Common Core Standards in North Carolina. Principals spend many hours wrestling with the problems of how to implement all of the mandates for which they are responsible. In short, principals want to know how to be effective instructional leaders and support student success.

This study did not seek the input of assistant principals who, in their leadership role, often are directly involved in initiatives such as Common Core. The researcher determined that the input of principals was important for this study and that future research seeking the input of assistant principals is needed.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 2 will provide a more in depth review of the research that has been reported related to the topic of principal efficacy and serves as a foundation for this study.

Topics include the Role of the Principal, Professional Development for Principals, and District Support for Principals and Self-Efficacy.

Chapter 3 includes a description of the research methods used in this study..

Chapter 4 reports the findings and contains an analysis of the perceptions of principals' preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. This study used descriptive research methods and survey instrumentation to gather and explore perceptions of principals. The results were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and chi-square tests to measure principal efficacy. Open ended comments were analyzed.

Chapter 5 includes a summary and discussion of the major findings. Recommendations for further study conclude the chapter.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review research related to the questions posed in this study, in order to provide a rationale and a context for understanding the perceptions of principals for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards in their schools and the factors related to those perceptions. The chapter begins with an examination of the role of the principal, and expands to professional development provided to principals to lead change in their school. The final section of this chapter focuses on support for principals in relation to leading change and the connection to their sense of self-efficacy.

The Role of the Principal

Principals are expected to produce the kind of results for their school that demonstrate high achievement for students from multiple student sub-groups. This focus on testing, and outcomes, was a central tenet of the No Child Left Behind legislation which placed attention on the improvement of test scores for all groups of students in schools by assuring that all teachers are highly qualified and parents have increased school choice (Darling-Hammond, 2004). Recent reform mandates like the Common Core Standards have created a new focus not only on the standards themselves, but on the pedagogy behind the standards (Mathis, 2010). To address this change principals are realigning resources, and establishing professional learning teams and school data teams to make sure their teachers are prepared for this change. This change has given principals the opportunity to expand their traditional leadership role to include instructional leadership, shared leadership, and distributed leadership as they seek to provide broad

support for teachers in implementing new mandates (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond 2003; Halverson, Grigg, Prichett & Thomas 2007).

Traditionally, the role of the principal has been one of school manager where the rules of the school were established and the operation of the building was the main component of the job (Brookover, 1978). This concept of the role of the principal, and the impact schools have on student achievement, has changed dramatically since the 1970s when Ronald Edmonds, Director of the Center for Urban Studies at Harvard University, researched and found schools where low income children were highly successful. The research of Edmonds (1979) came in response to a paper written in 1966 by James Coleman and funded by the U.S. Department of Education which concluded that schools did not make a positive difference in the achievement of children from low socio-economic families (Coleman, 1966). Edmonds (1979) and Lezotte's (1991) landmark Effective Schools research found that public schools do, in fact, make a difference in the lives of impoverished students, and low socio-economic students can achieve at a high level when schools have a clear mission, high expectations, instructional leadership, frequent monitoring of students, student time on task, safe and orderly environment, and positive home-scholl relations (Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, 1991). Research also indicates that high performing schools, regardless of socio-economic factors, were those where there was a focus on high standards, that achievement for students was at the center of the instructional program, and the principal was expected to articulate a cohesive vision for the school (Wenglinsky, 2004; Keith, 2008; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Dufour and Marzano, 2011). Changes continued to occur into the 1990s when principals shifted their role to that of instructional leader through efforts such as site based management which

sought to share leadership roles within the school (Sergiovanni, 2005). While the principal's role is critical to student achievement, instructional leadership from the principal is found to have the most impact when principals focus on both the instructional needs of the school and the resource needs of the school (Hallinger, 2005; Grissom & Loeb, 2010; Fuller, Young & Baker, 2011). Furthermore, Wahlstrom & Louis (2008) found that "when the power differential between principals and teachers is lessened, instruction is positively affected." (p.483)

Thus, over the past three decades, the principal's role has moved from one of manager to that of the instructional leader focused on the selection of quality teachers, the development of teacher teams, and the development of a trusting school culture that supports those teachers and includes them in the decision making process (Fuller, Young and Baker, 2011). Research indicates that these leadership opportunities for teachers have supported a sense of community and student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004; Elmore, 2000; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Harris, 2007; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). As a result of the implementation of a major change such as Common Core, many principals have adopted leadership strategies such as distributed leadership. The principal's role in distributed leadership becomes that of supporting the development of an environment where, like a web, responsibilities are stretched over the school setting (Spillane et al., 2004). This leadership role should not imply the delegation of responsibilities, because the principal must remain at the center of the activities related to the improvement of the school. As Wahlstrom, Louis, Leithwood, and Anderson (2010) noted in their description of the role of the principal:

> Distributing leadership more widely in schools should not be viewed as a means of reducing principals' workload. Leadership from teacher leaders and external sources is most likely to be goal-or initiative-specific. Principals, on the other hand, are responsible for a boundary spanning role not typically performed by others, nor picked up by others in the absence of active principal leadership. Principals are typically involved in a great many leadership initiatives in their schools, including initiatives for which others have assumed lead roles. Their role to coordinate or link others' leadership efforts is essential. (p.65)

Distributed leadership provides one way for principals to address the many job expectations related to instructional leadership while continuing to support the operational demands of the position such as student safety, running buses, managing the cafeteria, chairing Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings, handling district office requests, and other demands associated with the daily operation of the school (Cohen, 2001). As noted by Leithwood et al. (2004), the principals' role is to set a positive vision for the school and the faculty, students and staff and, in fact, this may have more of an impact on student achievement than more direct involvement in the instruction.

A review of the literature revealed that the role of the principal is changing to one that requires multiple areas of focus that include both the instructional needs and the resources needs of the school (Hallinger, 2005; Grissom & Loeb, 2010; Fuller, Young & Baker, 2011). However, given these demands, many principals are unprepared to lead change in their schools given the lack of professional development to prepare them to meet the increasing demands of their job (Barth, 1986; Evans & Mohr, 1999; Guskey, 2003; Scherer, 2002; Hershberg, Simon & Lea-Kruger, 2004; Sorenson, 2005). Keith

(2008) noted "This possible lack of professional development opportunities hinders principals from remaining current with both state and federal mandates (p.120). Without adequate preparation, principals may lack the self-confidence to lead their schools through difficult challenges (McCormick, 2001). The self-efficacy of the principal is directly related to student achievement and district support is critical in this effort (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Elmore, 2000). Watson, Chemers and Preiser, (2001) found that principals also have a role in strengthening the efficacy of members of the entire group.

The role of the principal in building schools that perform well while leading change depends on their ability to interact and communicate effectively with the larger social and organizational context (Leithwood et al., 2004). Research has pointed to the importance of developing trust among the faculty as a key role for principals who expect to have success in today's school environment. This often takes the form of Professional Learning Communities where the focus is on collaborative learning and building trust among the community of learners, rather than teaching alone (Dufour, 2002; Dufour, 2004; & Dufour & Marzano, 2011). Seashore Louis, Dretzke, and Wahlstrom (2010) stated, "The concept of organizational trust has been a staple of organizational research for some time. It matters a great deal whether participants in an organization trust the decision-making capacity of the organization's leaders" (p.41). Furthermore, Marzano, Waters, and Mcnulty (2005) identified 21 different responsibilities of the principal. In order for principals to fulfill all of their responsibilities, including the primary responsibility of student achievement, they have to work through their faculty. Thus, the literature indicates the principal has moved from a more isolated leadership role to that of

a leader who remains engaged with the faculty and staff, but who trusts them with leadership duties. This change has come about in large part due to the changes brought about mandates such as NCLB and the Common Core.

The following section of the literature review will discusses professional development opportunities for principals to prepare them for the implementation of these mandates.

Professional Development for Principals

This study focused on the extent to which principals felt they were prepared to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. In the last section research was reviewed on the role of the principal. This section focused on the literature associated with training of principals to lead in their leadership role. Due to the disassociation between the role of the principal and preparation for principals to lead in those roles, many principals are leaving the profession (Fernandino & Tirozzi, 2000; Nicholson & Leary, 2001). Research has also found that many higher education institutions are not keeping pace with the changes in curriculum and instruction such as the Common Core Standards to adequately prepare principals for the demands of their positions (Barkley, Bottoms, Feagin, & Clark, 2001). Fuller et al. (2010) contended that principal preparation programs should focus on how to recruit and select well qualified teachers as a central focus of professional development. Furthermore, state departments of education and school districts do an equally poor job of training principals (Barth, 1986). It has also been made clear in the literature that there has been an increase in the need for technical, conceptual, and people skills among school leaders (Salazar, 2007).While there is extensive literature supporting the importance of professional development for teachers

(Boyle, While, & Boyle, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 1999; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001), unfortunately, in the current educational environment, school leaders are often in need of additional professional development support to meet the needs of their diverse jobs (Young, 2002; Levine, 2005).

Most professional development is inconsistent and has not been associated with any clear results for students (Guskey, 1997). The unfortunate result is an approach to professional development that lacks focus and is not job embedded. Research supports the need for consistent professional development that meets the needs of principals in developing a positive school culture and improving their schools in a changing and increasingly complex educational environment (Barth, 1986; Evans & Mohr, 1999; Guskey, 2003; Scherer, 2002; Sorenson, 2005). Moreover, increased professional development for principals impacts their self-confidence and efficacy which leads to increased competence and job satisfaction (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Howley, Chadwick, & Howley, 2002). Therefore, it is up to the principals to find sources of action that provide them with experiences that support their professional development and self-efficacy. The literature suggests two avenues that show promise for principals to gain important professional growth opportunities: collaborative inquiry and mentoring.

Drago-Severson (2007) suggested that collaborative inquiry provides opportunities to develop more in-depth school goals, identify problems, and seek ways to solve them in teams. This process helps principals to use writing, dialog, and teaming to have the experience of mastering a problem within their school context. Dana, Tricarico, and Quinn (2009) examined five principals and their engagement in the intentional study of their own practice. They found that inquiry is an innovative model for professional

development that is systematic and not random. Principals develop their capacity as they resolve issues facing their own school. Principals researched areas such as the "implementation of the continuous improvement model, the assessing of the impact of goal setting on the lowest quartile of student, and exploring the alternatives to suspension as a disciplinary consequence (p.244). Thus, collaborative inquiry has proven to be solid approach to supporting principals in their many leadership roles.

Smith (2010) found that collaborative inquiry helps leaders to shape their own identities and knowledge within their own context of practice. When principals are a part of a collaborative team where leadership is distributed within a school seeking to solve problems together, then educators are empowered to play a meaningful role at all levels (Smith, 2010). The study found that principals benefited from collaborative inquiry in the following ways:

1. Increased critical thought and reflection.
2. Extended cognitive frameworks.
3. Heightened examination of thinking, actions, and the implications of decisions.
4. Deepened professional ethical knowledge
5. Enhanced leadership efficacy. (p.120)

Another area of promise in the professional development literature is with regard to mentoring. Davis et al. (2005) found that one of the key elements in developing effective school leadership was an emphasis on mentoring. Grissom and Harrington (2010) maintained that mentoring is important because it links theory and practice for the principal. They stated that "administrator mentoring or coaching will be positively

associated with principal performance" (p.589). Their study also suggested that a good mentoring program will have clearly defined outcomes and strong screenings for mentors and protégés. It was also suggested that further research was needed on the impact of high-quality mentors in the literature (p.608).

Mentoring is designed to help new principals in the areas of empathy, problem solving, increased confidence, and the sharing of ideas (Searby, 2010). It is also suggested that while mentoring is common for new principals, the preparation of the protégé, and his or her dispositions, for the mentorship experience is critical. This important study (Searby, 2010) found a gap in principal preparation programs on the importance of preparing themselves to be good protégés. If new principals are better prepared for their mentoring experiences they can better learn from their mistakes, remain open to new ideas, develop interpersonal skills, develop accountability, take initiative, and cultivate self-efficacy to effectively lead their schools.

District Support for Principals and Self-Efficacy

The literature emphasizes the importance of the role of the principal. The literature also pinpointed the critical skills necessary to be a successful principal. Grissom and Loeb (2010) associated this with the lack of research available related to the job of the principal and the complexity of the position. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) found that the principals' sense of collective efficacy is directly related to student achievement. The socio-psychological theory of Bandura (1977; 1986) suggests that self-efficacy, the belief about one's own ability, and collective efficacy, the belief about the ability of one's colleagues is critical to persevering through difficult challenges. Bandura (1977) pointed to four key areas that he based expectations of personal efficacy on: performance

accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological state. He stated the following with regard to self-efficacy:

> Performance based treatments not only promote behavioral accomplishments but also extinguish fear arousal, thus authenticating self-efficacy through enactive and arousal sources of information. Other methods, however, provide fewer ways of acquiring information about one's capability for coping with threatening situations. By postulating a common mechanism of operation, this analysis provides a conceptual framework within which to study behavioral changes achieved by different modes of treatment. (p. 195)

Without self-efficacy or the self-confidence to lead through difficult challenges the literature suggests that principals are more likely to feel inadequately prepared and they will achieve little change in initiatives required in our current educational environment (McCormick, 2001). Thus, to lead in areas such as the implementation of the Common Core Standards, principals will need the support of their district offices to assure that they are prepared to lead. As Seashore Louis et al. (2010) found: "Districts that help their principals feel more efficacious about their school improvement work have positive effects on school conditions and student learning" (p.127).

District support for schools is critical given that changes such as those related to the Common Core, not to mention standards based reform, are targeted at impacting the classroom and student achievement (Elmore, 2000). Furthermore, efforts such as site-based management have not produced the types of results that were hoped for because they lacked the substantive investments from district offices to achieve the change in structure postulated (Peterson, 1998; Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992). School leaders need

increased autonomy in making decisions and building capacity at the school level. As Honig and Rainey (2011) argued, school "autonomy initiatives" represent a new approach to school improvement and principal leadership of school improvement in three distinctive ways: "a central emphasis on teaching and learning, a focus on and investment in school capacity building, and the involvement of district central offices as key implementation supporters" (p.7). By creating an environment of support within districts where schools and district offices are mutually supportive of initiatives, such as the implementation of the Common Core Standards, there is far more focus on teaching and learning and school capacity building. This mediation of the demands placed on schools through central offices support can help to focus school level decisions on what is best for students and better enable implementation of reforms such as the Common Core at the school level (Honig & Rainey, 2011; Firestone & Shipps, 2005; Marks & Nance, 2007). Other research by Honig and Coburn (2008) suggested that the use of data by district offices to focus resources that truly support schools, and school leaders in leading change, in their critical need areas is a critical step for school districts. In order for principals to feel adequately prepared to lead change in their schools, they need financial and professional support from their district offices particularly in the area of coherent policies that guide the district.

With a higher degree of support for schools and school leaders in the implementation of policies, there is a higher degree of coherence between the demands of the policy and the implementation at the classroom level. School leaders may choose to participate in programs that are external to their school culture by, as Honig and Hatch

(2004) pointed out, “bridging” the school use of goals with external demands (p.23). Honig and Hatch (2004) went on to say:

> For example, school leaders have reported that participation in state and federal programs sometimes provided them with a language and a set of activities for realizing previously elusive goals and strategies and, in some cases, amending their goals and strategies to reflect this new knowledge (Elmore, 1996; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999). (p.23)

Research by Spillane et al (2004) indicated that schools may alternatively only symbolically adopt external policies and not fully incorporate those changes into their daily practice. Honig and Hatch (2008) referred to this practice as “buffering” (p.24). District offices can avoid this “by continually searching for and using information about school goals, strategies, and experiences to inform their own operations” (p.26).

Thus, districts have an important role to play in the improvement of schools and the self-efficacy of school leaders. District leaders must have a vision for the school system and, through that vision, support a continual focus on student achievement through strong instructional practice. Districts should hire the best possible candidates for school leadership positions who believe in their ability to meet the challenges of the position (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). They go on to say, “It is not enough to hire and retain the most capable principals – they must believe they can successfully meet the challenges of the task at hand” (582). As Seashore Louis et al. (2010) stated:

> Efficacy is enhanced when the district provides human and financial resources to assist schools in achieving those high expectations. Because principals have greater efficacy when districts have targeted and phased focuses for improvement,

> districts should require the development of improvement plans in all schools, with improvement goals expected to be clear and aligned with state and district standards, but with considerable discretion left to the school to determine the paths to goal achievement (p. 164).

In order for principals to acquire sufficient knowledge and experience to be and feel prepared to lead implementation of changes, they need continual training and support. Principals play a critical role in their school. This chapter explored the relevant research with regard to the role of the principal, professional development opportunities for principals, and how district support for principals impacts self-efficacy. The fact that principals are expected to lead the implementation of sweeping initiatives such as the implementation of the Common Core Standards principals require district office support in their leadership roles. This has substantial implications for professional development.

As Nicholson, Harris-John and Schimmel, (2005) noted in their research of professional development for principals:

> Traditional views of professional development for principals have proven disappointing and inadequate to principals. They were based mainly on the assumptions that periodic in-service offerings need to be remedial in nature; that the goal of professional development is to transfer knowledge from experts to practitioners; that the most effective way for principals to learn is to listen to a speaker; and that professional development for principals is a luxury, taking up valuable resources and time. (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1994, (p.15).

While the literature shows that principals do not receive adequate professional development to lead their schools in each of their areas of responsibility, they continue to be charged with creating professional relationships, leading teacher teams within their schools, and creating trust in both theory and practice in their school environment (Noonan & Walker, 2008).

While the literature on the relationship between high performing principals and student achievement is clear (Hallinger & Heck, 1996b, 1998; Hill, 1998; Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003; Nicholson, Harris-John, & Schimmel, 2005; Leithwood & Wahlstrom, 2008), few studies have been published on the policies that support practicing principals in their positions once they are at work (Grissom & Loeb, 2010). If principals do not have adequate training to lead change, established through state and district policy, they may not have the self-efficacy to lead their schools in change such as the Common Core Standards. Research by Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) on the impact of site based management (SBM) suggests that little evidence has been found to support the relationship between SBM and student outcomes. Furthermore, research suggests that state and district policy have not resulted in a loss of local control by schools, but that in fact school leaders may embrace policies that provide a focus for their schools (Honig & Rainey, 2011).

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals regarding their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. A descriptive research approach was used to answer the following research questions:

1. How do principals from across NC perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?
2. What are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?

Principals from across North Carolina were surveyed to determine their level of preparation to lead the Common Core and to understand the efficacy of school leaders and the extent to which school leaders perceived themselves to be supported by district office (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). This study sought to outline the level of support that principals felt that district office had provided them in this process. Furthermore, this study reviewed the impact that factors such as student poverty, number of students with disabilities, experience level of the principal, and school level of the principal had on their perceptions. It was the hope of the researcher that this study, through the lens of principal self-efficacy, would shed light on the impact that self-efficacy and self-confidence have on school leaders in leading the implementation of these new curriculum standards.

Design

The design of this study followed closely the design of Keith (2008) when she conducted a similar survey of Virginia principals as to their desirability for professional development in meeting the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. Permission was received from Keith (2008) to utilize the survey instrument that she used in a study of Virginia principals. The current study aimed to replicate the Keith (2008) study of Virginia principals vis a vis No Child Left Behind with North Carolina principals with regard to their preparedness to lead the implementation of the common core standards. The design of this study used quantitative research methods and descriptive statistics to understand current principal perceptions at the time of the study. Creswell (2003) stated: "A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population" (p.175). This quantitative study measured the self-perception of principals' preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core in North Carolina. This study used descriptive research methods and survey instrumentation to gather and explore perceptions of principals regarding their level of self-efficacy and to assess their needs for professional development support. The population consisted of principals from across North Carolina's eight regions.

The survey instrument was pilot tested to examine validity and reliability. It consisted of 37 questions divided into two parts. The first part consisted of demographic information used to answer Research Question 2. The second part of the survey answered Research Question 1 one pertaining to principals' self-perceptions of their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. The second part of the survey

also provided insight into principals' perception of district office support for principals in the implementation of the Common Core and Essential Standards.

Data for both the pilot test and the actual survey were collected using a cover letter and electronic survey that were emailed to all principals in North Carolina (Creswell, 2003). In order to solicit a maximum possible response, the principal was asked to return the survey by email to the researcher. The results were then analyzed using descriptive statistical methods particularly frequencies, percentages, and chi-square tests. Each of the responses to the survey questions were interpreted to measure the principals' sense of self-efficacy in their leadership roles and to outline specific areas of professional development needs for principals in North Carolina.

The researcher sought to understand the self-perceived preparedness of principals from across North Carolina to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. Thus, the level of the principal was chosen as the sampling unit to be surveyed. Since the population to be surveyed extended across North Carolina descriptive research methods was determined to be the most appropriate method to use in this study. As a result of this method, data was gathered from principals in each of the eight regions of North Carolina. A further rationale for using survey methodology is the rapid response and the efficiency of the design (Fowler, 1988). Through this study results were produced that indicate the level of support of district offices in preparing school leaders and the potential impact this may have on the principals' self-efficacy and self-confidence to lead.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument was pilot tested to examine validity and reliability and consisted of 37 questions. The first part of the survey consisted of 11 demographic

questions and answered Research Question 2. The second part of the survey consisted of 26 questions and answered Research Question 1 pertaining to principals' perception of their level of efficacy to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. The survey was designed so that results could be ranked based on areas that principals felt that they were most prepared to lead. Principals also ranked their level of preparedness in leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards using a verbal intensity scale consisting of four points: *Strong, Moderate, Little, None.*

Population

The population for this study consisted of principals from across North Carolina. 2,400 principals were surveyed from across North Carolina and consisted of a distribution of participants from each level, elementary, middle, and high schools. Results from the survey will support the study in generalizing from the sample to the entire population so that conclusions can be drawn as to the attitude of North Carolina principals toward the perceptions of their preparedness to implement of the new standards (Babbie, 1990). A database of North Carolina principals was obtained through the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. A cover letter with a copy of the survey was sent to each principal requesting both their permission and their response to the survey questions. Each North Carolina principal was surveyed on a voluntary basis and all principals who responded were included in the study. A response rate of 25% was obtained in the final sample.

Data Collection

A cover letter was sent to each principal who volunteered to participate in the study with instructions for completing the survey online. As discussed in the literature, the

cover letter outlined the importance of the participant, the purpose of the study, assurances, and information on completion and return of the survey (Creswell, 2003). The survey was sent to the principals electronically. Principals were then asked to respond to the survey electronically using the Qualtrics system through Western Carolina University. The survey was re-sent on three separate occasions electronically to those principals who had failed to respond. With the use of technology, and given the nature of the study design, a quick turnaround of two months in retrieving the study data was achieved.

Data Analysis

The first step in data analysis was to analyze the number of returned surveys from the population. The percentage of surveys returned by various demographic categories was used to determine how well those responding represented the population surveyed. This process was conducted to assess response bias and help to determine the impact on the overall study the non-responses may have (Fowler, 1988). A statistical analysis of all variables in the study was conducted. Descriptive statistics were used to determine means, frequencies, and percentages in the data. The responses to the 26 self-efficacy statements were compared with the 11 demographic questions using chi-square test of association to see if there was a relationship between them. The level of significance was set at .01 meaning that the probability was 1% or less that the relationship found in the sample was from random sampling error rather than a real relationship in the population.

Validity and Reliability

The survey consisted of 26 efficacy questions that were used to measure the self-perceived preparedness of principals from across North Carolina to lead the

implementation of the Common Core Standards in each of their schools. A 4-point verbal intensity scale *(none, little, moderate, strong)* was used to measure the self-perceived level of preparedness of principals. To maintain content validity as outlined by Creswell (2003), questions should "represent all of the possibilities of questions available" (p.172). Content reliability was established by pilot testing the survey instrument with former principals from across North Carolina. Based on responses received, the survey instrument was modified to reflect those concerns to address response bias (see Appendix A). The survey was cross sectional as explained by Creswell, (2003) to understand the perception of principals from across North Carolina "at one point in time to assess attitudes immediately and quickly" (p.415). The survey instrument, consisting of 37 questions, was reviewed for content and facial validity by the researcher in conjunction with lead professional development facilitators and curriculum specialists from North Carolina Local Education Agencies and the Department of Public Instruction. This review took place before the pilot testing of the survey instrument.

Analysis and Reporting

Principals were also asked to rate their efficacy based on specific statements related to their self-perception of preparedness to lead the Common Core. Based on principal rating, responses were ranked to better understand their perceived preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. Following the model Creswell (2003) recommends, the data was scored so that there was a numeric value assigned to each response category for each question. Demographic data was gathered about each principal. Responses were analyzed using an ordinal and categorical scale using frequencies and percentages for each category. The data was summarized using

tables to demonstrate principal preparedness statements from highest to lowest. To summarize the data, valid percentages were aggregated and compared by rank ordering each of the 26 statements using “Strong” and “Little/None” using the highest valid percent response in each category. A space was also provided in the survey instrument for principal open ended comments.

The first research question focused on principals’ rankings of their efficacy to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. Data were analyzed with the frequency and percentage answers for each question. Preferences for professional development were rank ordered and examined to provide a list of the strongest preferences for professional development among the statements.

The second research question addressed differences in demographic data and descriptive data among each of the principals surveyed. To answer this question, cross-tabulations with chi-square tests of association were used.

This chapter outlined the survey design methods used in this study and provided the manner in which content validity were established. This chapter also established the methods for capturing the sample, data collection, data analysis, and validity and reliability.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals regarding their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. This study also sought to better understand what factors are related to their sense of efficacy and determine if there are differences in those factors. This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do principals from across NC perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards Standards?
2. What are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?

To answer the research questions in this study, a survey was developed consisting of 11 demographic questions and 26 efficacy statements. A list of all principals from North Carolina was obtained from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Electronic mailing addresses were uploaded into the Qualtrics system enabling the survey to reach 2400 elementary, middle, and high school principals. SPSS, a statistical software package, was used for all calculations.

Demographic and Descriptive Data

A variety of demographic data was gathered to gain a better understanding of the principals and their schools. North Carolina principals returned 617 surveys out of 2,600, a 25% response rate; 326 surveys were returned from elementary schools, 107 surveys were returned from middle school, 108 surveys were returned from high schools, 20 surveys were returned from early college high schools and 20 from alternative high

schools. Table 1 shows the summarized data from each question using frequencies and percentages for the total number of principals responding to the survey.

Table 1

Demographic Data

Descriptive Data	
Male Respondents	44.20%
Female respondents	55.80%
School levels	
Elementary school	56.10%
Middle school	18.40%
High school	18.60%
Early college high school	3.40%
Alternative school	3.40%
Level of experience	
1-5 years	44.80%
6-10 years	30.10%
11-20 years	17.20%
20+ years	7.90%
Percent of minority students	
0-24%	39.90%
25-49%	26.80%
50-74%	19.20%

75-100%	14.20%
Percent of students with IEP's	
0-24%	81.70%
25-49%	16.20%
50-74%	1.00%
75-100%	1.00%
Percent of Gifted students	
0-24%	87.6
25-49%	10.30%
50-74%	1.70%
75-100%	0.30%
Percent of students with Limited English Proficiency	
0-24%	87.30%
25-49%	11.40%
50-74%	1.20%
75-100%	0.20%
Percent of students living in poverty	
0-24%	10.40%
25-49%	24.10%
50-74%	40.00%

75-100%	25.50%
Percent of schools Title I status	
School-Wide Title I	50.90%
Receive Title I Funding	5.70%
Receive No title I Funding	43.40%
Number of hours of training received in Common Core	
10 Hours or less	24.70%
11-20 Hours	26.20%
20 + Hours	49.10%
North Carolina region represented by respondents	
Region 1	10.95
Region 2	7.50%
Region 3	11.70%
Region 4	10.40%
Region 5	16.30%
Region 6	14.00%
Region 7	14.00%
Region 8	15.20%

As shown in Table 2, the majority of the respondents were female (55.8%), were principals of elementary schools (56.1%), and had less than 10 years of experience

(74.9%). In terms of the schools they represented, the majority of schools had 0-24% in the following categories: minority students (39.9%), students with IEP's (81.7%), Gifted students (87.6%), students with Limited English Proficiency (87.3%). However, with regard to the number of students living in poverty, the majority of respondents reported having up to 74% of their students living in poverty (74.5%) with 25% of the respondents reporting between 75-100% poverty at their schools. Additionally, the majority of respondents reported school-wide Title I status (50.9%). The majority of principals reported receiving over 20 hours of training in Common Core (46.2%).

The final descriptive question pertained to the North Carolina region represented by the respondent. The North Carolina State Board of Education breaks the state down into 8 regions. The majority of respondents reported from region 5 and region 8. A map of the 8 regions of North Carolina is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Regions set by the North Carolina State Board of Education

Principal Preparedness Rating

The survey consisted of 26 questions related to principal preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core standards within their schools. For the purpose of this study, the principal perception of his or her level of preparedness as it relates to the 26 questions constitutes their level of efficacy. Thus, the 26 statements of preparedness are also considered "statements of efficacy." An introduction to this section stated the following:

> The survey statements ask about your preparedness to lead in areas related to the implementation of the Common Core Standards. An additional question is included at the end of the survey for any specific information you would like to share about the content of each question. For the purpose of this survey, preparedness refers to your personal knowledge as a principal in North Carolina. (See Table 2 or Appendix A)

Table 2

List of the 26 Efficacy Statements Used in the Survey.

1. **Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness**
2. **Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA**
3. **Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in Math**
4. **Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods**
5. **Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college**
6. **Understanding and analyzing data**
7. **Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like**
8. **Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards**
9. **Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum**
10. **Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty**
11. **Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities**
12. **Understanding data-driven decision making**
13. **Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher with a focus on the Common Core Standards**
14. **Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards**
15. **Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the Common Core Standards**
16. **Satisfaction with financial support from my district office**
17. **Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office**
18. **Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office**
19. **Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my district office**
20. **Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice**
21. **Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the**

changes in instructional practice, attitude, and behavior
22. **Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data**
23. **Understanding the foundations of effective special education**
24. **Supporting students who live in poverty**
25. **Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district**
26. **Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district**

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked, "How do principals from across NC perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?" To answer this question, a verbal intensity scale was used in the survey from the responses *Strong, Moderate, Little,* and *None*. Surveys which were returned with missing data were not considered in the valid percentage responses and were included in the "Missing" category. For the purposes of this study, and to summarize the data, and due to the low response rate in the *None* category, *Little* and *None* were combined to indicate a low level of principal preparedness.

North Carolina principals answered survey questions assessing their overall level of preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core standards. From the results we can extrapolate areas where principals need additional professional development, and further support from their district offices. To summarize the data, valid percentages were aggregated and compared by rank ordering each of the 26 statements based upon the highest percentages falling into the "Little/None" valid percent response in each category. The following two charts show the results of this data.

Table 3 ranks the 26 statements of efficacy based on the least preparedness using the *Little/None* category from the survey results.

Table 3

Statements Indicating Least Efficacy

	Statements Indicating Least Efficacy			
Rank	**Efficacy Questions asked about principal preparedness to lead in areas related to:**	**STRONG**	**MODERATE**	**LITTLE /NONE**
1	**Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district**	13.2	40.4	37.2
2	**Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college**	22.1	45.1	30.4
3	**Satisfaction with financial support from my district office**	22.6	47.1	28.4
4	**Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards**	18.6	56.1	25.1
5	**Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities**	19.5	56.2	23.7
6	**Understanding the foundations of effective special education**	24.9	51.7	23.2
7	**Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office**	34.2	41.6	23.0
8	**Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my district office**	30.0	46.8	21.4
9	**Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district**	31.2	47.6	19.9
10	**Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office**	35.1	44.3	19.3
11	**Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum**	21.2	60.6	18.0
12	**Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher with a focus on the Common Core Standards**	24.6	57.5	17.4
13	**Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty**	26.0	57.5	16.4
14	**Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards**	30.5	52.8	16.3
15	**Supporting students who live in poverty**	35.3	48.1	16.1
16	**Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the common Core**	23.8	60.7	15.0
17	**Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in**	27.2	58.9	13.5

	Math			
18	**Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA**	27.4	61.3	11.3
19	**Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice**	33.5	55.8	10.7
20	**Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the changes in instructional practice, attitude, and behavior**	36.8	52.3	10.5
21	**Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data**	39.0	50.5	10.4
22	**Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness**	39.9	49.5	10.3
23	**Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods**	41.5	50.0	8.5
24	**Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like**	41.3	51.7	7.0
25	**Understanding and analyzing data**	54.0	42.2	3.5
26	**Understanding data-driven decision making**	58.2	38.5	3.0

Table 4 ranks the 26 statements of efficacy based on the strongest assessment of preparedness using the "Strong" category from the survey results.

Table 4

Statements Indicating Strongest Efficacy

	Statements Indicating Strongest Efficacy			
Rank	**Efficacy Questions asked about principal preparedness to lead in areas related to:**	**STRONG**	**MODERATE**	**LITTLE /NONE**
1	**Understanding data-driven decision making**	58.2	38.5	3.0
2	**Understanding and analyzing data**	54.0	42.2	3.5
3	**Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods**	41.5	50.0	8.5
4	**Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like**	41.3	51.7	7.0
5	**Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness**	39.9	49.5	10.3
6	**Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data**	39.0	50.5	10.4
7	**Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the changes in instructional practice, attitude, and behavior**	36.8	52.3	10.5
8	**Supporting students who live in poverty**	35.3	48.1	16.1
9	**Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office**	35.1	44.3	19.3
10	**Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office**	34.2	41.6	23.0
11	**Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice**	33.5	55.8	10.7
12	**Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district**	31.2	47.6	19.9
13	**Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards**	30.5	52.8	16.3
14	**Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my district office**	30.0	46.8	21.4
15	**Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA**	27.4	61.3	11.3
16	**Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in Math**	27.2	58.9	13.5
17	**Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty**	26.0	57.5	16.4

18	**Understanding the foundations of effective special education**	24.9	51.7	23.2
19	**Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher with a focus on the Common Core Standards**	24.6	57.5	17.4
20	**Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the common Core Standards**	23.8	60.7	15.0
21	**Satisfaction with financial support from my district office**	22.6	47.1	28.4
22	**Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college**	22.1	45.1	30.4
23	**Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum**	21.2	60.6	18.0
24	**Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities**	19.5	56.2	23.7
25	**Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards**	18.6	56.1	25.1
26	**Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district**	13.2	40.4	37.2

The data suggests a need for professional development training for principals across North Carolina. Almost 40% of principals felt little to no satisfaction with preparation in Common Core training from outside of their districts. Thirty percent of principals also suggested that they have little to no efficacy with regard to providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not receive this training in college. For instance, “Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district” was ranked as the lowest in Table 4, but it also ranked highest in Table 3 with regard to least efficacy. This data further suggests the need for districts to provide solid training for principals using resources within the district on Common Core given the fact that sources from outside of the district may not be effective or widely accessed.

Of particular note is that there were only two statements of efficacy where over 50% of principals rated themselves as strong (Table 4). Those statements were (1) understanding data driven decision making (58.2%), and (2) understanding and analyzing data (54.0%). Furthermore, only 41% of the 571 principals surveyed felt strongly prepared that they know what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, "What are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?" In order to answer this question each of the 26 efficacy statements were cross-tabulated with the 11 demographic statements to create 286 cross-tabulations. The data were analyzed to determine if there were any significant relationships that exist in the data. To begin, data were recoded so that "Little/None" responses were combined into one category. This left the 26 efficacy questions with *Strong, Moderate, Little to None* as responses. This change was necessary due to the small number of "None" responses in the survey, and in order to compare the data subgroups. The chi-square test cannot be used if there are too few cases in the table cells. Furthermore, "N/A" was recoded as "Missing" since that question result did not apply for that principal.

The chi-square comparisons between groups that were run at the .05 level of significance resulted in over 50 significant relationships in the data. The .05 level indicates that there is only a 5% chance the results are due to a sampling error rather than a true relationship in the sample population. In order to answer the research question, it was determined to analyze the data from a .01 level of significance which means that

there is only a 1% chance that the results are due to a sampling error rather than a true relationship in the population.

The chi-square test was used in this study to compare proportions of subgroups. The data was interpreted looking at the chi-square value and the significance value. If significance is less than .01, then it means that the relationship in the sample is most likely representing a relationship in the population. The significance indicates the probability that a random error exists, if there is a small chance of a random error, less than 1% in this study, then the relationship must be real. Therefore, of the relationships found in this study of less than .01, the null hypothesis was rejected that there is no relationship between variables. Furthermore, SPSS truncates at probabilities of less than .0005, and just reports sig.=.000, so this means there is less than .0005 or .05% chance of making an error if the null hypothesis is rejected.

Although there were several significant relationships found between the individual demographic questions and the individual efficacy questions (see Appendix D), only one clear trend emerged from the chi-square analyses. There was a consistent relationship found between hours of training received and the 26 efficacy statements. In fact, 23 of the 26 efficacy statements were significantly related to the hours of training received as shown in Table 6. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8, clearly indicate that more hours of training received was strongly associated with greater self-reported efficacy.

The following tables 5, 6, 7, and 8, reflect differences in number of hours of training in Common Core (10 hours or less, 11-20 hours, 20 + hours). As presented in the following tables, significant differences were found in relation to hours of training in the Common Core. In all of the analyses, principals who reported 20+ hours of training in the

Common Core answered that they had strong efficacy in implementing various components of the Common Core. These findings suggest that training is important for principals' preparedness to lead their schools in the implementation of Common Core. As a result of this research there were numerous significant relationships with regard to hours of training. Thus, the tables reflecting the survey results were clustered based on themes. Following are the findings related to hours of training.

As noted in Table 5, those principals with 20 or more hours of training reported that they had strong efficacy redesigning their school in order to increase effectiveness. Furthermore, principals reported strong efficacy in implementing the Common Core in ELA, implementing the Common Core in Math, ensuring that teachers are trained in the Common Core, and providing core reading knowledge to teachers who did not get this training in college, compared to principals who had 10 hours or less of training.

Table 5

Efficacy Regarding School Leadership

Efficacy Questions asked about principal preparedness to lead in areas related to:	**10 HOURS**	**11-20 HOURS**	**20 + HOURS**
1. **Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness**			
STRONG	26.9%	38.6%	47.3%
MODERATE	57.5%	49.05%	46.2%
LITTLE/NONE	15.7%	46.2%	6.6%
CHI-SQUARE=19.767; df=4; p<.01			
2. **Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA**			
STRONG	13.4%	21.2%	37.7%
MODERATE	59.0%	71.2%	56.8%
LITTLE/NONE	27.6%	7.5%	5.5%
CHI-SQUARE=66.700; df=4; p<.01			

3. **Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in Math**			
STRONG	14.3%	21.5%	37.0%
MODERATE	57.1%	68.1%	58.9%
LITTLE/NONE	28.6%	10.4%	13.7%
CHI-SQUARE=50.836; df=4; p<.01			
4. **Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods**			
STRONG	22.25	34.5%	54.8%
MODERATE	56.3%	59.3%	41.9%
LITTLE/NONE	21.5%	6.2%	3.3%
CHI-SQUARE=68.488; df=4; p<.01			
5. **Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college**			
STRONG	15.8%	19.4%	27.9%
MODERATE	39.1%	49.6%	47.9%%
LITTLE/NONE	45.1%	30.9%	24.2%
CHI-SQUARE=21.129; df=4; p<.01			

Those principals with 20 or more hours of training reported that they had strong efficacy in understanding and analyzing data (Table 6). Furthermore, this factor ranked second (54.0%) out of the 26 efficacy statements in principals rankings of strong efficacy. Additionally, principals with 20 or more hours of training reported strong efficacy in knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like, describing changes in assessments that accompany the Common Core, articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum, raising the achievement level of students who live in poverty and students with disabilities. Finally, understanding data driven decision making was the factor that had the highest percentage of principals reporting strong efficacy at 58.2 percent compared to principals who had 10 hours or less of training.

Table 6

Efficacy Regarding Curricular Issues

6. **Understanding and analyzing data**			
STRONG	42.9%	56.8%	58.3%
MODERATE	49.6%	39.7%	40.2%
LITTLE/NONE	7.5%	3.4%	1.5%
CHI-SQUARE=15.808; df=4; p<.01			
7. **Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like**			
STRONG	34.3%	34.9%	48.0%
MODERATE	51.55	56.8%	49.1%
LITTLE/NONE	14.2%	8.2%	2.9%
CHI-SQUARE=23.595; df=4; p<.01			
8. **Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards**			
STRONG	11.3%	11.7%	26.1%
MODERATE	51.15%	63.4%	54.4%
LITTLE/NONE	37.6%	24.8%	19.5%
CHI-SQUARE=29.368; df=4; p<.01			
9. **Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum**			
STRONG	10.6%	14.5%	30.0%
MODERATE	58.3%	68.3%	57.5%
LITTLE/NONE	3.1%	17.2%	12.5%
CHI-SQUARE=39.051; df=4; p<.01			
10. **Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty**			
STRONG	22.7%	22.2%	29.9%
MODERATE	51.5%	59.7%	59.0%
LITTLE/NONE	25.8%	18.1%	11.1%
CHI-SQUARE=15.892; df=4; p<.01			
11. **Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities**			
STRONG	11.4%	16.4%	25.2%
MODERATE	59.1%	57.5%	54.8%
LITTLE/NONE	29.5%	26.0%	20.0%
CHI-SQUARE=13.719; df=4; p<.01			

12. **Understanding data-driven decision making**			
STRONG	45.8%	56.8%	64.8%
MODERATE	44.3%	41.8%	34.4%
LITTLE/NONE	9.9%	1.45%	0.7%
CHI-SQUARE=34.364; df=4; p<.01			

As shown in Table 7, those principals with more than 20 hours of training reported that they had strong efficacy with aligning the teacher evaluation process with the new standards, realigning resources to match the new standards, understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area, coaching and guiding teachers in the continuous improvement process. Furthermore, principals with this level of training reported strong efficacy with guiding Professional Learning Community teams and addressing changes in instructional practice, and supporting student who live in poverty.

Table 7

Efficacy Regarding Changes in School Resources and Design

13. **Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher, with a focus on the Common Core Standards**			
STRONG	17.6%	22.2%	29.3%
MODERATE	57.3%	57.6%	58.6%
LITTLE/NONE	25.2%	20.1%	12.1%
CHI-SQUARE=15.105; df=4; p<.01			
14. **Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards**			
STRONG	21.55	28.3%	36.0%
MODERATE	50.0%	55.2%	53.3%
LITTLE/NONE	28.5%	16.6%	10.7%
CHI-SQUARE=23.672; df=4; p<.01			
15. **Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the common Core Standards.**			
STRONG	13.8%	16.7%	32.4%
MODERATE	56.2%	68.8%	59.2%
LITTLE/NONE	30.0%	14.6%	8.5%
CHI-SQUARE=45.815; df=4; p<.01			
20. **Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice.**			
STRONG	21.1%	28.5%	42.1%
MODERATE	58.6%	62.5%	51.3%
LITTLE/NONE	20.3%	9.0%	6.6%
CHI-SQUARE=31.711; df=4; p<.01			
21. **Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the changes in instructional practice, attitude, and behavior**			
STRONG	26.0%	30.3%	45.8%
MODERATE	60.3%	60.0%	44.6%
LITTLE/NONE	13.7%	9.7%	9.6%
CHI-SQUARE=19.551; df=4; p<.01			
24. **Supporting students who live in poverty**			

STRONG	29.0%	31.0%	40.8%
MODERATE	45.0%	53.1%	47.4%
LITTLE/NONE	26.0%	15.9%	11.8%
CHI-SQUARE=16.542; df=4; p<.01			

Those principals with 20 or more hours of training reported that they had strong efficacy regarding satisfaction with professional development support, communication on Common Core, response to concerns with implementation of Common Core from their district offices (Table 8). Furthermore, principals with 20 or more hours of training reported strong efficacy regarding satisfaction with training inside and outside of their districts.

Table 8

Efficacy Regarding Satisfaction with School District Issues

17. **Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office**	10 HOURS	11-20 HOURS	20 + HOURS
STRONG	17.1%	32.6%	44.3%
MODERATE	45.0%	45.85	38.4%
LITTLE/NONE	38.0%	21.5%	17.3%
CHI-SQUARE=36.747; df=4; p<.01			
18. **Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office**			
STRONG	17.1%	34.0%	45.4%
MODERATE	51.9%	47.9%	39.5%
LITTLE/NONE	31.0%	18.1%	15.1%
CHI-SQUARE=34.780; df=4; p<.01			
19. **Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my district office**			
STRONG	13.4%	30.3%	38.9%
MODERATE	52.05%	45.5%	46.3%
LITTLE/NONE	34.6%	24.1%	14.8%
CHI-SQUARE=34.984; df=4; p<.01			

25. **Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district**			
STRONG	8.5%	24.3%	46.7%
MODERATE	51.9%	57.6%	41.1%
LITTLE/NONE	39.5%	18.1%	12.2%
CHI-SQUARE=81.927; df=4; p<.01			
26. **Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district**			
STRONG	4.9%	10.9%	21.2%
MODERATE	38.5%	49.6%	44.8%
LITTLE/NONE	56.6%	39.5%	34.0%
CHI-SQUARE=28.584; df=4; p<.01			

During the data analysis, additional significant relationships were found within the sample between the 26 efficacy questions and 11 of the demographic variables. Table 9 indicates that there was a significant relationship between the respondent's years of experience as a principal and 4 factors related to their level of efficacy. Table 10 indicates that there is a significant relationship between school Title I status and 2 factors related to the level of efficacy of principals. Years of experience and Title I status are discussed in Table 9 and Table 10 because there are multiple efficacy factors related to those demographic variables. These relationships are discussed more fully in chapter 5. Data regarding other significant relationships that emerged from this study are provided in tables in Appendix D.

Those principals with 20 or more years of experience reported strong efficacy in raising the achievement level of students living in poverty and students with disabilities, understanding how to interpret research findings and data, and understanding the foundations of effective special education (Table 9). The data shows that in each of these

relationships there is a 20% difference between principals with more than 20 years of experience when compared to those with 5 years or less of experience.

Table 9

Relationship Between Principal Level of Experience and Efficacy

Efficacy Questions asked about principal preparedness to lead in areas related to:	**1-5 YEARS**	**6-10 YEARS**	**11-20 YEARS**	**20 + YEARS**
1. **Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty**				
STRONG	20.6%	23.9%	37.6%	40.9%
MODERATE	58.0%	62.6%	50.0%	52.3%
LITTLE/NONE	21.4%	13.5%	13.3%	6.8%
CHI-SQUARE=20.573; df=6; p<.002				
2. **Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities**				
STRONG	14.9%	18.5%	25.5%%	37.0%
MODERATE	55.8%	59.3%	58.2%	47.8%
LITTLE/NONE	29.3%	22.2%	16.3%	15.2%
CHI-SQUARE=19.534; df=6; p<.003				
3. **Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data**				
STRONG	32.9%	38.3%	47.4%	58.7%
MODERATE	55.6%	48.1%	48.5%	37.0%
LITTLE/NONE	11.5%	13.6%	4.1%	4.3%
CHI-SQUARE=19.033; df=6; p<.004				
4. **Understanding the foundations of effective special education**				
STRONG	18.9%	24.7%	32.0%	43.5%
MODERATE	53.1%	56.2%	47.4%	39.1%
LITTLE/NONE	28.0%	19.1%	20.6%	17.4%
CHI-SQUARE=18.710; df=6; p<.005				

Table 10 provides the response percentages for Principals of schools that receive Title I funding who reported stronger efficacy in the areas of providing core knowledge

to novice teachers who did not get this training in college, and supporting students who live in poverty than principals of schools who receive no Title I funding.

Table 10

Relationship Between School Title I Status and Efficacy

Efficacy Questions asked about principal preparedness to lead in areas related to:	**School-Wide Title I**	**Receive Title I Funding**	**Receive No Title I Funding**
1. **Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college**			
STRONG	30.1%	34.5%	12.2%%
MODERATE	44.1%	41.4%	49.1%
LITTLE/NONE	25.7%	24.1%	38.7%
CHI-SQUARE=27,754; df=4; p<.000			
2. **Supporting students who live in poverty**			
STRONG	43.3%	32.3%	26.1%
MODERATE	45.1%	51.6%	52.1%
LITTLE/NONE	11.6%	16.1%	21.8%
CHI-SQUARE=20,343; df=4; p<.000			

Open Ended Comments

Principal perceptions were also gathered through open ended comments. This was the final question of the survey. This allowed principals to give any statements or comments regarding the Common Core, and to further clarify their level of preparation with leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards in their schools. To summarize, comments generally related to the amount of training time principals had received and, specifically, the lack of training principals received in Common Core as well as the speed of implementation of this significant change in their schools. A

compilation of each of the statements provided by principals from this study is presented in Appendix F.

Efficacy Regarding School Leadership

Principals expressed need for additional exposure to Common Core in order to effectively lead their schools. The data shows that unless the shifts in standards, pedagogy, and assessment are clearly understood by principals the role of leading schools with strong efficacy is more challenging. One principal commented: "The move to the Common Core has been too fast. Principals should have had a training year, then teachers, and then implementation. We are always rushing changes through." Principals expressed frustration that no training leading up to Common Core implementation was specifically designed for principals, and that they have been left out of the training process on Common Core by the district and the state ,"The information provided by our district has been basically a URL forward. Principals have had little specific training in the Common Core, so my information from what I can read from DPI and in collegial conversation." Another principal stated:

> I feel my teachers have received a lot of support and staff development. I would have liked for principals to have received more training at the state level since this was a statewide initiative. It is difficult to evaluate teachers effectively when you have had to get your own training on the CC.

Efficacy Regarding Curricular Issues

While some principals were left out of trainings, some principals said that they had been involved directly in district teams associated with Common Core

implementation. The data indicates that these experiences gave them the efficacy to lead and support their faculty,

> I have been involved on our district level Common Core Team. I have attended numerous trainings on the math curriculum. In addition, I have developed a variety of professional development opportunities for my school and the district. Even though math is my strength, I have made it a goal this year to learn the ELA curriculum because our school improvement goals really focus around reading.

Some districts supported their schools by partnering with organizations designed to help with the development of curriculum around the new standards. One principal commented: "My district has contracted with the Leadership and Learning Center to improve my school. It's been extremely helpful in understanding the ELA Common Core standards, using formative assessments, and data driven decision making." However, there are areas of the curriculum, such as the new assessments, that were very difficult for principals to prepare for "it is hard to receive any training with regard to assessments since no one knows what the CCS final assessments are going to look like." While there was training available across the state on the new assessments, and many aspects of Common Core, clearly some principals did not attend. Furthermore, these comments reinforce the data from table 16 that show stronger efficacy with regard to curricular issues in principals who have received additional training in Common Core.

Efficacy Regarding Changes in School Resources and Design

As principals design their School Improvement Plans and as they align resources to match the new standards, coach teachers, guide Professional Learning Communities, and evaluate teachers, one principal expressed concern in the following way:

> My concern is that most of the communication and training are only surface level that with reduced manpower and other duties of the principal I am unable to research and apply at the level needed. This is the same for my teaching staff. All the training workshops, meetings, etc. takes them away from their students and planning time. Making teachers accountable before they have even had time to learn and understand the expectations have increased the anxiety level. District staff members are just as overloaded. One resource that I believe would be helpful at the school level is another administrator to help with the instructional initiative and a teacher leader position (funded by the state) to help drive curriculum and 21st century skills.

Another principal commented on the confusion created by these changes "Problem is lack of definition from DPI. It is difficult to provide direction and answers if there is continuing ambiguity from the State." The budget cuts and the lack of personnel to address the new standards changes coupled with the challenge of supporting students who live in poverty is causing principals concern.

Efficacy Regarding Satisfaction with School District Issues

The data indicated in table 18 strong efficacy with regard to satisfaction with district issues. Some principals were very positively satisfied with the district support they had received: "My district has supplied abundant information and training on the Common Core." Another principal commented: "Overall, I believe my district has done a good job in helping us to plan for and implement the Common Core transition." While principals did express concerns with their district support of the Common Core, they also recognized issues at the state level "I am concerned by the disconnect between the state

board of education and the legislature. I believe neither one of them are truly in touch with the students of this state." Finally, one second year principal summed up the need for more support with a strong statement that established her leadership needs:

> I believe that these areas will strengthen with more time and experience, as well as, exposure to CC/ES information. Because support in implementation is moderate due to the change being brand new, more time and understanding is needed to be ranked strong Also, I am only in my 2nd year as a principal. Not having a lot of experience and coming into this position during a time of major change, I believe I need more support and resources to strengthen.

The open ended response question demonstrated the degree to which principals across North Carolina are frustrated with the implementation of the Common Core. Principals expressed dissatisfaction with the speed with which implementation has occurred and the lack of training regarding implementation. While some principals commented that there was sufficient training on Common Core, a majority of respondents indicated that there was also concern with the depth of training received by principals and staff. Principals also stated that district office personnel had attended training and the trainings had not occurred at the school level. There was general agreement among principals that training from outside of the district was insufficient.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings, present implications, recommendations, a summary of the research pursued in this study and present a discussion of the conclusions from the study. The discussion and conclusions of this study are drawn from the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals regarding their level of preparation, and efficacy, as it relates to the implementation of the Common Core standards in their respective schools. Through this research, the theoretical and practical understanding of the role and needs of principals is advanced by consideration of data gathered from some 600 North Carolina principals. Specifically, the data gathered presents a framework for understanding more fully areas where principals feel strong efficacy and little efficacy. This is especially important because North Carolina principals are held accountable for the performance of their schools, and that accountability is based on the results of student assessments related directly to the Common Core standards. This chapter reviews the purpose of this study and discusses the findings of the research in order to answer the research questions. This chapter also presents recommendations for future actions that can increase principal efficacy related to Common Core as well as recommendations for further study.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-perceptions of North Carolina principals regarding their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core in their schools.

Primary Research Questions

This study surveyed principals from across North Carolina. Principals were asked to rate their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards by

using a verbal intensity scale consisting of four points: *Strong, Moderate, Little, None.* This study followed the design of Keith (2008) and utilized the same efficacy statements, but focused on the Common Core as opposed to No Child Left Behind.

The design of this study was structured to answer the following research questions:

1. How do principals from across NC perceive their efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?
2. What are the factors related to principal perceptions of self-efficacy for leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards?

Research Design and Methods

A survey was developed and distributed to each North Carolina principal through electronic mail. Email addresses were obtained for each principal though the North Carolina Department of public Instruction and loaded into the Qualtrics system for distribution. The survey was replicated in part from the research study conducted by Keith (2008) and supported by research (See Appendix A). Principals were asked 11 demographic and descriptive data questions. In addition, principals were surveyed on 26 efficacy statements to determine their self-perceptions of preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common core Standards in their schools.

The emailing of the survey included a cover letter outlining the research study and a link to the survey in Qualtrics. When surveys were completed a thank you email was sent to principals. In the case of principals who did not return the survey, a follow-up reminder was sent to encourage principals to participate. A total of 617 surveys were returned (25%), 326 surveys were returned from elementary schools, 107 surveys were

returned from middle school, 108 surveys were returned from high schools, 20 surveys were returned from early college high schools and 20 from alternative high schools., from across North Carolina. There were three large districts in North Carolina who, through a research screening process, did not allow their principals to participate directly. However, given the population response from each of the eight regions of North Carolina the response rate was consistent statewide. Furthermore, the return rate of this study does suggest that principals in North Carolina were interested in voicing their self-perception regarding their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards in their schools.

Research Question 2 was developed to determine if certain demographic factors had an impact on the self-perceptions of principals' preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. From the survey research results were then analyzed using descriptive statistical methods particularly frequencies, percentages, and chi-square tests. The chi-square test was used in this study to compare proportions of subgroups. The data was interpreted looking at the chi-square value and the significance value. If significance is less than .01, then it means that the relationship in the sample is most likely representing a relationship in the population. The significance indicates the probability that a random error exists, if there is a small chance of a random error, less than 1% in this study, then the relationship must be real. Therefore, of the relationships found in this study of less than .01, the null hypothesis was rejected that there is no relationship between variables. A $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for the purposes of this study.

Major Findings

This study revealed important information about principal efficacy and the need for support for principals in terms of professional development training, mentoring and collaborative inquiry to increase their efficacy for meeting the demands of initiatives such as the Common Core and leading change in their schools.

Leadership Related to Training

One finding of the study that was that the more hours of training that principals receive, the more prepared they feel to lead implementation of the Common Core. This study has shown that without the proper training in relation to leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards principals do not perceive themselves to have a high level of self-efficacy. In fact, the survey results indicated that in the 26 efficacy statements there were significant relationships found between demographic question 10: Number of hours of training in Common Core (Instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Taxonomy) and 23 of the efficacy statements (See Appendix A). Of the 26 efficacy statements, only the following three statements did not represent a strong relationship to hours of training:

a. Efficacy statement 16 – Satisfaction with financial support from my district office.
b. Efficacy statement 22 – Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data.
c. Efficacy statement 23 – Understanding the foundations of effective special education.

Furthermore, when statements of efficacy were ranked principals said that efficacy statement 26: Satisfaction with Common Core training I have received from

outside of my district represented an area of least efficacy. Moreover, support received from district office regarding financial support, professional development, response to concerns, Common Core training and communication were all areas that ranked low for principals with regard to support from their district offices.

Also, there was a significant relationship found between the school level of the principal and providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers. Principals from elementary schools reported stronger efficacy related to supporting teachers in reading than those from middle and high schools. Furthermore, principals from schools with a higher percentage of children living in poverty and who had school-wide Title I status at their school reported stronger efficacy in providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers.

Finally, there was a significant relationship found between principal experience level and several efficacy statements. Principal reports indicated a strong relationship between their level of experience in efficacy statement in the following areas:

a. Efficacy statement 10 - Raising the achievement level of students who live in poverty. Principals with more than 20 years of experience reported two times the level of efficacy than those with less than 10 years of experience.
b. Efficacy statement 11 - Raising the achievement of students with disabilities. Principals with more than 20 years of experience reported over two times the level of efficacy than those with less than 10 years of experience.
c. Efficacy statement 12 – Understanding data driven decision making. Principals with over 11 years of experience reported significantly stronger

efficacy in this area than those principals with less than 12 years of experience.

d. Efficacy statement 22 - Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data. Principals with a higher level of experience reported stronger efficacy on this statement.
e. Efficacy statement 23 - Understanding the foundations of special education. Principals with more experience reported stronger efficacy regarding this statement.

Discussion of Major Findings

North Carolina principals are expected to work in an atmosphere of high expectations, accountability for implementing state and federal mandates, and increased student achievement. In order to effectively lead change in the high stakes environment of their schools they must have professional development training in the areas that they are responsible for. A review of the literature revealed a lack of professional development for principals that adequately prepares them to meet the needs of the job. However, the results of this study clearly indicate that there is a significant relationship between hours of training principals received in Common Core and their perceived self-efficacy for leading the implementation of this initiative. In fact, in 23 of the 26 efficacy questions there was a significant correlation with training. Overall, the study shows that principals expressed a clear need for more training in areas related to leading the Common Core.

Aside from the efficacy statements related to satisfaction with district office support, the three efficacy statements in which principals reported the least efficacy were:

d. Efficacy statement 5 – Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college.
e. Efficacy statement 8 – Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards.
f. Efficacy statement 11 – Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities.

It should come as no surprise that principals perceive a lack of self-efficacy with regard to leading the implementation of the Common Core Standards. This research has demonstrated that there has been a lack of professional development provided to principals to help them in the process of implementing this important change in their schools. The continued focus on assessment and research based instructional methodology, coupled with the high stakes grades for schools and continued funding cuts leaves schools with high expectations for results and low morale. Dufour and Marzano (2011) stated "creating the conditions to help others succeed is one of the highest duties of a leader" (p.86). It is more important than ever to provide professional development for principals that support them in their areas of critical need such as working with students who live in poverty or students with disabilities. As Keith (2008) found in her research of Virginia principals,

> since the current mandates assure that the programs and services for children with disabilities are in absolute compliance with the law, it is essential that the building principals be knowledgeable and prepared to supervise the array of special education services within their school and to make decisions regarding best practices. (p.118)

Recommendations

This study supports the following recommendations:

1. Principals from across North Carolina should be provided increased training opportunities to prepare them for all aspects of their leadership positions.
2. Principals from across North Carolina should be trained in areas such as providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers, describing changes in assessments that accompany the Common Core Standards and raising the achievement level of students with disabilities and students who live in poverty.
3. Given the relationship between principal level of experience and efficacy, job embedded support initiatives such as principal mentoring programs, or principal Professional Learning Communities should be implemented to support principals to increase their efficacy.
4. Quality, ongoing professional development opportunities should be provided for principals from across North Carolina from both inside their district and from the North Carolina Department of Public instruction.
5. Increase district office support for principals through clear policies that address the financial and professional development needs of school leaders from across North Carolina.

Implications for Policy and Practice

As social cognitive theory suggests, mastery experiences are critical for the development of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Principals need additional training in areas in which they are expected to lead in order to develop strong self-efficacy beliefs about their own leadership capacity (Moak, 2010). Professional development opportunities must be provided to principals to address this critical need in North Carolina. The first research question from this study focused on ranking efficacy statements of principals by using frequency and percentage answers from each question. Based on those results, professional development should focus in the areas of providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers, describing changes in the assessments that accompany the Common Core Standards, and raising the achievement level of students with disabilities and students who live in poverty.

The results of this study indicate that future research is needed regarding the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs of principals and student outcomes.

Conclusion

Today, principals are expected to not only manage their schools effectively, but they are expected to understand multiple teaching strategies, coaching models, data analysis to support student achievement as well as redesign and set the direction of the school (Davis et al. 2005). In North Carolina, as a part of the Excellent Schools Act, there is more pressure than ever before to increase student achievement because schools will be given grades to ensure accountability. Principals are held accountable for teacher results on state mandated assessments, and school grades are based on the aggregate results of those individual teacher scores. All of these accountability measures are loaded into both the evaluation of the teacher and the principal. When standards such as the Common

Core are adopted, and assessments are normed to address the new standards, district offices must be there to support principals both through policy and professional development (Honig & Rainey, 2011). Principals are also held accountable for the academic improvement of economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners to make sure that students are making progress toward their goals. According to Wahlstrom & Louis (2008) the principal does make a difference in a schools success "No matter who the respondent is-teacher, custodian, education assistant, specialist, office support staff-they all seem to know good (and bad) leadership when they experience it" (p.459).

Common Core is being implemented for the second year in North Carolina. One conclusion drawn from this research study showed that principals who have received more than 20 hours of training in areas related to the implementation of Common Core have responded with strong efficacy in implementation of the new standards. However, many school leaders from across North Carolina remain untrained and unprepared to fully lead implementation of this sweeping change. Principals have yet to see the new assessments that will accompany the new standards. It would be prudent for North Carolina to slow down the process of giving schools grades based on results from these new assessments because we might find ourselves in a situation like the one we saw with No Child Left Behind where teachers were forced to teach to a test, instead of focusing on student learning. Additional time for implementation of Common Core would give North Carolina principals a chance to prepare to lead this change by receiving increased training specific to Common Core.

Finally, while this research revealed a need for more training for principals across North Carolina (Hamilton, Ross, Steinbach & Leithwood, 1996; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach 1999; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009), this research also demonstrated that principals who had more years of experience had more efficacy with regard to meeting the needs of schools in areas such as students who live in poverty, students with disabilities, and working with novice teachers in the area of reading instruction. Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004), stated, "Principals with a strong sense of self-efficacy have been found to be persistent in pursuing their goals, but are also more flexible and more willing to adapt strategies to meeting contextual conditions" (p.574). It has been suggested in this research that areas such as collaborative inquiry, mentoring, and distributed leadership could provide ways to support principals in their important roles Drago-Severson, 2007; Smith, 2010; Spillane, (2005). Hopefully results from this study will assist with new understanding regarding the adequacy of professional development that principals have received with regard to leading the implementation of Common Core Standards.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E. (1990) *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bandura, A., (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review,* 84(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (4, 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Bandura, A., (1996). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy. Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Barkley, S., Bottoms, G., Feagin, C. H., & Clark, S. (2001). Leadership Matters: Building Leadership Capacity. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Barth, R. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68* (4), 293–296.

Boyle, B., While, D. & Boyle, T. (2004). A Longitudinal study of teacher change: What makes professional development effective? *Curriculum Journal* 15(1): 45-68.

Brookover, W. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 15,* 301-318.

Cohen, G.S. (2001). The school leadership challenge. *Strategies, 8*. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/publications/strategies/index.htm.

Coleman, James S. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity (COLEMAN) Study (EEOS), 1966 (Computer File). ICPSR06389-v3. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 2007-04-27. doi: 10.3886/ICPSR06389.

Conger, C.L., & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design:* Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dana, N., Tricarico, K., & Quinn. D. (2009).The administrator as action researcher: A case study of five principals and their engagement in systemic, intentional study of their own practice. *Journal of School Leadership, 19,* 232-265.

Daresh, J. C. (2001). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.* Seattle: University of Washington Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *The Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1047-1085.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M.,Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, A. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary Leadership development programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School Leadership Study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Institute.

Drago-Severson, E. (2007). Helping teachers learn: Principals as professional development leaders. *Teachers College Record*, 109, 70-175

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational leadership*, *59*(8), 12-15.

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a" professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership*, *61*(8), 6-11.

DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2011). *Leaders of learning: How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership.* October, 1979.

Elmore, R. F.(2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, D.C: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Evans, P. M., & Mohr, N. (1999). Professional development for principals: Seven core beliefs. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(7), 530-32.

Fahey, K. (2011). Still learning about leading: A leadership critical friends group. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 6(1), 1-35.

Fernandino, V.L., & Tirozzi, G.N., (2000). *The shortage of principals continues*Retrieved from http://www.naesp.prg.

Firestone, W. A., & Shipps, D. (2005). How do leaders interpret conflicting account abilities to improve student learning. A new agenda for research. *Educational Leadership*, 81-100.

Fowler, F.J. (1988). *Survey Research Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fuller, E., Young, M., & Baker, B. D. (2011). Do principal preparation programs influence student achievement through the building of teacher-team qualifications by the principal? An exploratory analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(1), 173-216.

Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman,B.F. & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal* 38 (4): 915-94.

Goldring, E.B., & Pasternak, R. (1994). Principals' coordinating strategies and school effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5*(3), 239-253.

Grissom, J. & Harrington, J. (2010). Investing in administrator efficacy: An examination of professional development as a tool for enhancing principal effectiveness. *American Journal of Education,*116, 583-612.

Grissom, J.A., & Loeb, S., (2010). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *CALDER Working Paper No. 3.* National Center for Educational Research.

Guskey, T. R. (1997). Research needs to link professional development and student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 18(2).

Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(10), 748-750.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1996b). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educationa Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 221-239.

Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2007). The new instructional leadership: Creating data-driven instructional systems in schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*, 159–193.

Hamilton, D. N., Ross, P. N., Steinbach, R., & Leithwood, K. A. (1996). Differences in the socialization experiences of promoted and aspiring school administrators. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*, 346-367.

Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(3), 315-325.

Hershberg, T., Simon, V. A., & Lea-Kruger, B. (2004). The revelations of value-added. *The School Administrator, 61*(11), 10-14.

Hill, P. (1998). Shaking the Foundations: Research-driven school reform. *School Effectiveness and school improvement, 9*(4), 419-436.

Honig, M., & Coburn, C. (2008). Evidence-based decision making in school district central offices: Toward a policy and research agenda. *Educational Policy, 22*(4), 578–608.

Honig, M. I., & Hatch, T. C. (2004). Crafting coherence: How schools strategically manage multiple, external demands. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 16-30.

Honig, M.I., & Rainey, L.R., (2011). Autonomy and school improvement: what do we know and where do we go from here? *Educational Policy,* 1-31.

Howley, A., Chadwick, K., & Howley, C. (2002). Networking for the nuts and bolts: The ironies of professional development for rural principals. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 17*(3), 171-188.

Jackson, B., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38*(2), 192–212.

Keith, D. L. (2008). Principals desirability for professional development. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 15(2), 95-128.

Knapp, M.S., Copland, M.A., & Talbert, J.E. (2003). *Leading for learning: ReflectiveTools for school and district leaders* (research report). Seattle, WA: Center For the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of research for the learning from Leadership Project.* New York: Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times. Changing education series*. Florence, KY: Taylor and Francis Group.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The Contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496-528.

Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 529-561.

Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., (2008). Leadership and learning: what these articles tell us. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 593.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating School Leaders.* New York: The Education School Project.

Lezotte, W. (1991). Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation. Effective Schools Products, Ltd., Okemos, MI.

Lyons, C. A., & Murphy, M. J. (1994). *Principal self-efficacy and the use of power.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 73-84.

Marks, H. M., & Nance, J. P. (2007). Contexts of accountability under systemic reform: Implications of principal influence on instruction and supervision. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1), 3-37.

Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works*. Bloomington,IN: Solution Tree Press.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Alexandria: ASCD McRel.

Mathis, W.J. (2010). The 'common core" standards initiative: An effective reform tool? Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education and Policy Interest Research Unit. Retrieved from http://epicpolicy.org/publication/common-core-standards

McCormick, M.J. (2001). Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: Applying social cognitive theory to Leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 8(1), 22-33.

Moak, J. (2010). The self perception of leadership efficacy of elementary principals and the effects on student achievement. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Neumerski, C. M. (2012). Leading the improvement of instruction: Instructional leadership in high-poverty, urban schools. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Nicholson, B. L., & Leary, P. A. (2001). Appalachian principals assess the efficiency and appropriateness of their training. *Planning and Changing, 32,* 3 & 4, 199-213.

Nicholson, B., Harris-John, M., & Schimmel, C. (2005). *Professional development for principals in the accountability era.* Applachia Educational Laboratory at Edvantia Charleston, WV.

Noonan, B. & Walker, K. (2008). Trust in the contemporary principalship. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and policy*, 85, 1-17

O'Neill, K., Fry, B. Hill, D., & Bottoms,G. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund.

Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T.C., (2007). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (9th ed.). Toronto, Canada: Pearson Education.

Osterman, K., & Sullivan, S. (1996). New Principals in an Urban Bureaucracy: A Sense of Efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership*, *6*(6), 661-90.

Peterson, G. J. (1998, April). *Demonstrated actions of instructional leaders: A case study of five superintendents.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Prussia, G.E., Anderson, J.S., & Manz, C.C. (1998). Self leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,19,* 523-538.

Salazar, P. S. (2007). The professional development needs of rural high school principals: A seven-state study. *The Rural Educator*, 28(3), 20-27.

Scherer, M. (2002). Perspectives: Job one. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 5.

Searby, L. (2010). Preparing future principals: facilitating the development of a mentoring mindset through graduate coursework. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in learning,* 18(1), 5-22.

Seashore Louis, K., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *21*(3), 315-336.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The dark side of professionalism in educational administration. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(7), 521-526.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005, June). The virtues of leadership. In *The Educational Forum, 69,* 2, 112-123. Taylor & Francis Group.

Silins, H. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 272-298.

Smith, D. (2010). Developing leaders using case inquiry. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, *4*(2), 104-124.

Sorenson, R. (2005). Helping new principals succeed. *American School Board Journal, 192*(4), 61-63.

Spillane, J., Hallett, T., & Diamond, J.B. (2003). Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary schools. Sociology of Education, 76, 1–17.

Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *36*(1), 3-34.

Spillane, J. P. (2005) Distributed leadership. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., & Zeuli, J. S. (1999). Reform and teaching: Exploring patterns of practice in the context of national and state mathematics reforms. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21*(1), 1-27.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 573-585.

Wahlstrom, K., Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Executive summary of research findings. *Retrieved from The Wallace Foundation website: http://www. wallacefoundation.org*.

Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 458-495.

Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 Years of research tells us about the effects of leadership on student achievement.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and learning. Available online at www.mcrel.org.

Watson, C. B., Chemers, M. M., & Preiser, N. (2001). Collective efficacy: A multilevel analysis. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1057–1068.

Wenglinsky, H. (2004). The link between instructional practice and the racial gap in middle schools. *Research in Middle Level Education Online, 28*(1), 1-13.

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. (1992). Rethinking school-based management policy and research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*(4), 529-549.

Young, M.D.(2002). *Ensuring the university's capacity to prepare learning-focused leadership.* Report presented at the meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership, Racine, WI.

Youngs, P. & King, B.M. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Education Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 643-670.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Questionnaire

North Carolina Principal's Perceptions of Their Preparedness to Lead the Implementation of the Common Core Standards in Their Schools

PART A: Demographics

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate answer.

1. I am a:

   Male Female

2. I am a principal of a/an:

   Elementary School Middle School High School Early College

3. Level of experience as a principal:

   1-5 years 6-10 years 11-20 years 20+ years

4. The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total population:

   0-25% 26-49% 50-74% 75-100%

5. The following is representative of the percent of special needs children with IEPs from my school's total population:

   0-25% 26-49% 50-74% 75-100%

6. The following is representative of the percent of Gifted children from my school's total population:

   0-25% 26-49% 50-74% 75-100%

7. The following is representative of the percent of children with limited English proficiency from my school's total student population:

   0-25% 26-49% 50-74% 75-100%

8. The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my Free and Reduced Lunch count:

   0-25% 26-49% 50-74% 75-100%

9. The following is representative of my current Title I status:

   School-wide Title I Funding | Receive Title I Funding | Receive No Title I

10. Number of hours of training in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Taxonomy):

    1-5 years 6-10 years 11-20 years 20+ years

11. My school is located in Region:

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Part B

The following statements ask about your preparedness to lead in areas related to the implementation of the Common Core Standards. An additional line is included below each question for any specific information you would like to share about the content of each question. **For the purpose of this survey, preparedness refers to your personal knowledge as a principal in North Carolina.** Please use the scale below to circle your answer choices.

1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

12. Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

13. Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

14. Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

15. Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

16. Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

17. Understanding and analyzing data.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

18. Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

19. Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

20. Articulate to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

21. Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

22. Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

23. Understanding date-driven decision making.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

24. Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument with data and evidences from the teacher with a focus on the Common Core Standards.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

25. Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

26. Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, content area as required by the common Core Standards.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

27. As it relates to satisfaction with financial support from my district office.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

28. As it relates to satisfaction with professional development support from my district office.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

29. As it relates to satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

30. As it relates to satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my district office.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

31. Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

32. Guiding my Professional Learning Teams and addressing the changes in instructional practice, attitude, and behavior.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

33. Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

34. Understanding the foundations of effective special education.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

35. Supporting students who live in poverty.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

36. Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

37. Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district.

    1-Strong 2.Moderate 3.Little 4. None

    Additional Information----------

Appendix B

Pilot Test Consent Letter

Dear Administrator,

As a doctorate student at Western Carolina University, I am conducting a research study entitled: "Principal Preparedness to Lead the Implementation of the Common Core Standards."

In order to establish validity for the survey which will be used in this study, it is necessary that the questionnaire be subjected to pilot testing. Your help is needed in providing information concerning this survey. Please take a few moments to review this questionnaire and provide any critical feedback. Please read the survey for clarity and understanding, and make any changes directly to the survey which you feel will improve this survey. Please return these forms along with the edited survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope by Friday, January 11, 2008, or as soon as possible.

I sincerely appreciate your participation in this survey review. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (828) 206-4272 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Appendix C

Principal Letter of Consent

Dear Principal:

Enclosed you will find a survey which will be used to determine your level of preparedness as it relates to the implementation of the Common Core Standards. Your assistance is needed in providing information concerning the staff development needs that public school principals in North Carolina believe will influence student academic achievement. I believe this research will provide information for future studies in educational leadership.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. In consideration of your busy schedules, completion of this survey should only take no more than 10-15 minutes. As this survey is intended to include information representative of all North Carolina principals, it is necessary that principals from different areas and with different backgrounds be included in the final analyses of information. For that reason, your participation is essential and greatly appreciated. Results are anonymous and will not be connected to school names. Questions specific to background and experience are for assessment purposes only. Completion and submission of this survey will constitute consent to participate. There are no known risks to participation.

Aggregated results may be provided to your school system.

Please complete the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope no later than (date). If you have any questions, please contact me directly at (828) 206-4272.

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Appendix D

Cross Tabulations-Common Core

23 were significant, 3 were not: Search to find the 3 that were not significant (press control AND f simultaneously and Then Find next and put in xx) it will go to which are not.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness

Crosstab

			Redesigning my school (e.g. scheduling, grouping) in order to increase my school's effectiveness			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	36	77	21	134
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	26.9%	57.5%	15.7%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	56	71	18	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	38.6%	49.0%	12.4%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	129	126	18	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	47.3%	46.2%	6.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	221	274	57	552
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	40.0%	49.6%	10.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.767[a]	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.272	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.332	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	552		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.84.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA

Crosstab

			Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in ELA			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	18	79	37	134
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	13.4%	59.0%	27.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	31	104	11	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.2%	71.2%	7.5%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	103	155	15	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	37.7%	56.8%	5.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	152	338	63	553
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	27.5%	61.1%	11.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.700[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	61.292	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	52.950	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	553		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.27.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in Math

Crosstab

			Implementing the Common Core curricula and the instructional shifts in Math			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	19	76	38	133
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	31	98	15	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.5%	68.1%	10.4%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	100	148	22	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	37.0%	54.8%	8.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	150	322	75	547
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	27.4%	58.9%	13.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	50.836[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	47.789	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	42.195	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.24.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods

Crosstab

			Ensuring that my teachers are trained in Common Core instructional methods			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	30	76	29	135
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.2%	56.3%	21.5%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	50	86	9	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.5%	59.3%	6.2%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	148	113	9	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	54.8%	41.9%	3.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	228	275	47	550
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	41.5%	50.0%	8.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	68.488[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	64.827	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	60.003	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.54.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college

Crosstab

			Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	21	52	60	133
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	15.8%	39.1%	45.1%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	27	69	43	139

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	19.4%	49.6%	30.9%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	74	127	64	265
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	27.9%	47.9%	24.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	122	248	167	537
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.7%	46.2%	31.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.129[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.665	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.544	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	537		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.22.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Understanding and analyzing data

Crosstab

			Understanding and analyzing data			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	57	66	10	133
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	42.9%	49.6%	7.5%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	83	58	5	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	56.8%	39.7%	3.4%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	158	109	4	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	58.3%	40.2%	1.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	298	233	19	550
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	54.2%	42.4%	3.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.808[a]	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	15.187	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.594	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.59.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like

Crosstab

			Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	46	69	19	134
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.3%	51.5%	14.2%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	51	83	12	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.9%	56.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	131	134	8	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	48.0%	49.1%	2.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	228	286	39	553
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	41.2%	51.7%	7.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.595[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	23.249	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.237	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	553		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.45.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards

Crosstab

			Describing changes in assessments that accompany the new standards			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	15	68	50	133
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	11.3%	51.1%	37.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	17	92	36	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	11.7%	63.4%	24.8%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	71	148	53	272
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	26.1%	54.4%	19.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	103	308	139	550
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	18.7%	56.0%	25.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.368[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.964	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.884	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.91.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum

Crosstab

			Articulating to parents and the broader community the major shifts in curriculum			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	14	77	41	132
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	10.6%	58.3%	31.1%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	21	99	25	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	14.5%	68.3%	17.2%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	82	157	34	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	30.0%	57.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	117	333	100	550
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.3%	60.5%	18.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.051[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	38.376	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.311	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.00.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty

Crosstab

			Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	30	68	34	132
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.7%	51.5%	25.8%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	32	86	26	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.2%	59.7%	18.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	81	160	30	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	29.9%	59.0%	11.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	143	314	90	547
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	26.1%	57.4%	16.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.892[a]	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	15.516	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.241	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.72.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities

Crosstab

			Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	15	78	39	132
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	11.4%	59.1%	29.5%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	24	84	38	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	16.4%	57.5%	26.0%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	68	148	54	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	25.2%	54.8%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	107	310	131	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	19.5%	56.6%	23.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.719[a]	4	.008
Likelihood Ratio	14.160	4	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.194	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.77.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Understanding data-driven decision making

Crosstab

			Understanding data-driven decision making			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	60	58	13	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	45.8%	44.3%	9.9%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	83	61	2	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	56.8%	41.8%	1.4%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	177	94	2	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	64.8%	34.4%	.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	320	213	17	550
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	58.2%	38.7%	3.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.364[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.776	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.768	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.05.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher, wit...

Crosstab

			Aligning ratings on the teacher evaluation instrument, with data and evidences from the teacher, wit...			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	23	75	33	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	17.6%	57.3%	25.2%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	32	83	29	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.2%	57.6%	20.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	80	160	33	273
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	29.3%	58.6%	12.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	135	318	95	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	24.6%	58.0%	17.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.105[a]	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	15.185	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.267	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.71.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards

Crosstab

			Realigning resources in my school to match the new standards			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	28	65	37	130
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.5%	50.0%	28.5%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	41	80	24	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	28.3%	55.2%	16.6%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	98	145	29	272
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	36.0%	53.3%	10.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	167	290	90	547
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	30.5%	53.0%	16.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.672[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	22.667	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.443	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.39.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the common Core...

Crosstab

			Understanding changes in grade level, subject area, and content area as required by the common Core...			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	18	73	39	130
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	13.8%	56.2%	30.0%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	24	99	21	144
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	16.7%	68.8%	14.6%	100.0%

	20+ hours	Count	88	161	23	272
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	32.4%	59.2%	8.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	130	333	83	546
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	23.8%	61.0%	15.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.815[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.654	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.887	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	546		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.76.

XXXXX-THIS ONE IS NOT SIGNIFICANT

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction with financial support from my district office

Crosstab

			Satisfaction with financial support from my district office			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	21	60	45	126
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	16.7%	47.6%	35.7%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	38	67	39	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	26.4%	46.5%	27.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	65	133	72	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	24.1%	49.3%	26.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	124	260	156	540
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	23.0%	48.1%	28.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.867[a]	4	.209
Likelihood Ratio	5.935	4	.204
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.533	1	.060
N of Valid Cases	540		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.93.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office

Crosstab

			Satisfaction with professional development support from my district office			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	22	58	49	129
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	17.1%	45.0%	38.0%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	47	66	31	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	32.6%	45.8%	21.5%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	120	104	47	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	44.3%	38.4%	17.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	189	228	127	544
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.7%	41.9%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.747[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.401	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.022	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	544		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.12.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office

Crosstab

			Satisfaction with communication on Common Core from my district office			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	22	67	40	129
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	17.1%	51.9%	31.0%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	49	69	26	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.0%	47.9%	18.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	123	107	41	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	45.4%	39.5%	15.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	194	243	107	544
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	35.7%	44.7%	19.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.780[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	36.195	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.132	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	544		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.37.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my dis...

Crosstab

			Satisfaction in the response to concerns regarding the implementation of the Common Core from my dis...			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	17	66	44	127
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	13.4%	52.0%	34.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	44	66	35	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	30.3%	45.5%	24.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	105	125	40	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	38.9%	46.3%	14.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	166	257	119	542
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	30.6%	47.4%	22.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.984[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.218	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.963	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	542		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.88.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practi...

Crosstab

			Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practi...			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	28	78	27	133
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.1%	58.6%	20.3%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	41	90	13	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	28.5%	62.5%	9.0%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	114	139	18	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	42.1%	51.3%	6.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	183	307	58	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	33.4%	56.0%	10.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.711[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.305	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.131	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.08.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the changes in instructional practic...

Crosstab

			Guiding my Professional Learning Community teams and addressing the changes in instructional practic...			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	34	79	18	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	26.0%	60.3%	13.7%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	44	87	14	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	30.3%	60.0%	9.7%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	124	121	26	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	45.8%	44.6%	9.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	202	287	58	547
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	36.9%	52.5%	10.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.551[a]	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	19.691	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.683	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.89.

XXX THIS ONE IS NOT SIGNIFICANT

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data

Crosstab

			Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	45	63	23	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	34.4%	48.1%	17.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	53	76	16	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	36.6%	52.4%	11.0%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	116	138	18	272
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	42.6%	50.7%	6.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	214	277	57	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	39.1%	50.5%	10.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.381[a]	4	.015
Likelihood Ratio	11.837	4	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.366	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.63.

Xxx This one is not significant

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Understanding the foundations of effective special education

Crosstab

			Understanding the foundations of effective special education			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	30	62	39	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	22.9%	47.3%	29.8%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	29	79	38	146

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	19.9%	54.1%	26.0%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	77	143	51	271
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	28.4%	52.8%	18.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	136	284	128	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	24.8%	51.8%	23.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.897[a]	4	.064
Likelihood Ratio	8.928	4	.063
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.147	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.60.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Supporting students who live in poverty

Crosstab

			Supporting students who live in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	38	59	34	131
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	29.0%	45.0%	26.0%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	45	77	23	145

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	31.0%	53.1%	15.9%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	111	129	32	272
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	40.8%	47.4%	11.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	194	265	89	548
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	35.4%	48.4%	16.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.542[a]	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	15.735	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.064	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.28.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district

Crosstab

			Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received within my district			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	11	67	51	129
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	8.5%	51.9%	39.5%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	35	83	26	144

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	24.3%	57.6%	18.1%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	126	111	33	270
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	46.7%	41.1%	12.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	172	261	110	543
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	31.7%	48.1%	20.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.927[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	84.931	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	74.345	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	543		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.13.

Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta... * Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district

Crosstab

			Satisfaction with the Common Core training I have received from outside of my district			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	6-10 hours	Count	6	47	69	122
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	4.9%	38.5%	56.6%	100.0%
	11-20 hours	Count	14	64	51	129

		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	10.9%	49.6%	39.5%	100.0%
	20+ hours	Count	53	112	85	250
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	21.2%	44.8%	34.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	73	223	205	501
		% within Number of hours of training I have received in Common Core (instruction, pedagogy, Revised Blooms Ta...	14.6%	44.5%	40.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.584[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.900	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.382	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	501		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.78.

Appendix E

Cross Tabulations-Principal Variables

I am a principal of a/an * Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college

Crosstab

			Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
I am a principal of a/an	Elementary	Count	87	145	73	305
		% within I am a principal of a/an	28.5%	47.5%	23.9%	100.0%
	Middle	Count	15	41	41	97
		% within I am a principal of a/an	15.5%	42.3%	42.3%	100.0%
	High School	Count	12	45	43	100
		% within I am a principal of a/an	12.0%	45.0%	43.0%	100.0%
	Early College High School	Count	2	10	7	19
		% within I am a principal of a/an	10.5%	52.6%	36.8%	100.0%

	Alternative School	Count	6	7	4	17
		% within I am a principal of a/an	35.3%	41.2%	23.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	122	248	168	538
		% within I am a principal of a/an	22.7%	46.1%	31.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.954[a]	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.703	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.700	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	538		

a. 2 cells (13.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.86.

My level of experience as a principal * Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty

Crosstab

			Raising the achievement level of students living in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	50	141	52	243
		% within My level of experience as a principal	20.6%	58.0%	21.4%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	39	102	22	163
		% within My level of experience as a principal	23.9%	62.6%	13.5%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	36	49	13	98
		% within My level of experience as a principal	36.7%	50.0%	13.3%	100.0%

	20+ years	Count	18	23	3	44
		% within My level of experience as a principal	40.9%	52.3%	6.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	143	315	90	548
		% within My level of experience as a principal	26.1%	57.5%	16.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.573[a]	6	.002
Likelihood Ratio	20.283	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.199	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.23.

My level of experience as a principal * Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities

Crosstab

			Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	36	135	71	242
		% within My level of experience as a principal	14.9%	55.8%	29.3%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	30	96	36	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	18.5%	59.3%	22.2%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	25	57	16	98
		% within My level of experience as a principal	25.5%	58.2%	16.3%	100.0%

	20+ years	Count	17	22	7	46
		% within My level of experience as a principal	37.0%	47.8%	15.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	108	310	130	548
		% within My level of experience as a principal	19.7%	56.6%	23.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.534[a]	6	.003
Likelihood Ratio	18.518	6	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.036	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.07.

My level of experience as a principal * Understanding data-driven decision making

Crosstab

			Understanding data-driven decision making			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	123	112	9	244
		% within My level of experience as a principal	50.4%	45.9%	3.7%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	96	61	5	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	59.3%	37.7%	3.1%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	70	28	1	99
		% within My level of experience as a principal	70.7%	28.3%	1.0%	100.0%

	20+ years	Count	32	12	1	45
		% within My level of experience as a principal	71.1%	26.7%	2.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	321	213	16	550
		% within My level of experience as a principal	58.4%	38.7%	2.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.102[a]	6	.013
Likelihood Ratio	16.684	6	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.259	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	550		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.31.

My level of experience as a principal * Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data

Crosstab

			Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	80	135	28	243
		% within My level of experience as a principal	32.9%	55.6%	11.5%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	62	78	22	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	38.3%	48.1%	13.6%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	46	47	4	97

		% within My level of experience as a principal	47.4%	48.5%	4.1%	100.0%
	20+ years	Count	27	17	2	46
		% within My level of experience as a principal	58.7%	37.0%	4.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	215	277	56	548
		% within My level of experience as a principal	39.2%	50.5%	10.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.033[a]	6	.004
Likelihood Ratio	19.906	6	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.534	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

Crosstab

			Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	80	135	28	243
		% within My level of experience as a principal	32.9%	55.6%	11.5%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	62	78	22	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	38.3%	48.1%	13.6%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	46	47	4	97
		% within My level of experience as a principal	47.4%	48.5%	4.1%	100.0%
	20+ years	Count	27	17	2	46
		% within My level of experience as a principal	58.7%	37.0%	4.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	215	277	56	548

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.70.

My level of experience as a principal * Understanding the foundations of effective special education

Crosstab

			Understanding the foundations of effective special education			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	46	129	68	243
		% within My level of experience as a principal	18.9%	53.1%	28.0%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	40	91	31	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	24.7%	56.2%	19.1%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	31	46	20	97

		% within My level of experience as a principal	32.0%	47.4%	20.6%	100.0%
	20+ years	Count	20	18	8	46
		% within My level of experience as a principal	43.5%	39.1%	17.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	137	284	127	548
		% within My level of experience as a principal	25.0%	51.8%	23.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.710[a]	6	.005
Likelihood Ratio	17.863	6	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.441	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	548		

Crosstab

			Understanding the foundations of effective special education			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
My level of experience as a principal	1-5 years	Count	46	129	68	243
		% within My level of experience as a principal	18.9%	53.1%	28.0%	100.0%
	6-10 years	Count	40	91	31	162
		% within My level of experience as a principal	24.7%	56.2%	19.1%	100.0%
	11-20 years	Count	31	46	20	97
		% within My level of experience as a principal	32.0%	47.4%	20.6%	100.0%
	20+ years	Count	20	18	8	46
		% within My level of experience as a principal	43.5%	39.1%	17.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	137	284	127	548

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.66.

*****The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio... * Supporting students who live in poverty**

Crosstab

			Supporting students who live in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	0-24%	Count	65	112	37	214
		% within The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	30.4%	52.3%	17.3%	100.0%
	25-49%	Count	46	70	33	149

		% within The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	30.9%	47.0%	22.1%	100.0%
	50-74%	Count	44	51	11	106
		% within The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	41.5%	48.1%	10.4%	100.0%
	75-100%	Count	39	31	7	77
		% within The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	50.6%	40.3%	9.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	194	264	88	546
		% within The following is representative of the percent of minority children from my school's total populatio...	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.406[a]	6	.005
Likelihood Ratio	18.342	6	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.053	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	546		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.41.

The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr... * Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college

Crosstab

			Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	0-24%	Count	14	24	19	57
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	24.6%	42.1%	33.3%	100.0%
	25-49%	Count	20	51	53	124

		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	16.1%	41.1%	42.7%	100.0%
	50-74%	Count	42	116	58	216
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	19.4%	53.7%	26.9%	100.0%
	75-100%	Count	45	56	36	137
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	32.8%	40.9%	26.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	121	247	166	534
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	22.7%	46.3%	31.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.826[a]	6	.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.847	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.575	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	534		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.92.

The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr... * Supporting students who live in poverty

Crosstab

			Supporting students who live in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	0-24%	Count	9	28	21	58
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	15.5%	48.3%	36.2%	100.0%
	25-49%	Count	34	70	26	130
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	26.2%	53.8%	20.0%	100.0%

	50-74%	Count	79	112	28	219
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	36.1%	51.1%	12.8%	100.0%
	75-100%	Count	72	53	13	138
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	52.2%	38.4%	9.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	194	263	88	545
		% within The following is representative of the percent of children living in poverty based on my school's Fr...	35.6%	48.3%	16.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.537[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.383	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	40.081	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	545		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.37.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college

Crosstab

			Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	82	120	70	272
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	30.1%	44.1%	25.7%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	10	12	7	29
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	34.5%	41.4%	24.1%	100.0%
	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	28	113	89	230
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	12.2%	49.1%	38.7%	100.0%

Total	Count	120	245	166	531
	% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	22.6%	46.1%	31.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.754[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.019	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.135	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	531		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.55.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like

Crosstab

			Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	105	150	23	278
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	37.8%	54.0%	8.3%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	22	8	1	31
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	71.0%	25.8%	3.2%	100.0%
	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	97	127	14	238
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	40.8%	53.4%	5.9%	100.0%

Total	Count	224	285	38	547
	% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	41.0%	52.1%	6.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.590[a]	4	.009
Likelihood Ratio	13.452	4	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.142	1	.285
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.15.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Supporting students who live in poverty

Crosstab

			Supporting students who live in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	120	125	32	277
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	43.3%	45.1%	11.6%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	10	16	5	31
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	32.3%	51.6%	16.1%	100.0%
	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	61	122	51	234
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	26.1%	52.1%	21.8%	100.0%

Total	Count	191	263	88	542
	% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	35.2%	48.5%	16.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.343[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.539	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.033	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	542		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.03.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college

Crosstab

			Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	82	120	70	272
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	30.1%	44.1%	25.7%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	10	12	7	29
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	34.5%	41.4%	24.1%	100.0%

	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	28	113	89	230
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	12.2%	49.1%	38.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	120	245	166	531
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	22.6%	46.1%	31.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.754[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.019	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.135	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	531		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.55.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like

Crosstab

			Knowing what effective 21st century instructional practice looks like			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	105	150	23	278
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	37.8%	54.0%	8.3%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	22	8	1	31
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	71.0%	25.8%	3.2%	100.0%

	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	97	127	14	238
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	40.8%	53.4%	5.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	224	285	38	547
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	41.0%	52.1%	6.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.590[a]	4	.009
Likelihood Ratio	13.452	4	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.142	1	.285
N of Valid Cases	547		

a. 1 cells (11.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.15.

The following is representative of my current Title I status * Supporting students who live in poverty

Crosstab

			Supporting students who live in poverty			
			Strong	Moderate	Little	Total
The following is representative of my current Title I status	School-Wide Title I	Count	120	125	32	277
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	43.3%	45.1%	11.6%	100.0%
	Receive Title I Funding	Count	10	16	5	31
		% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	32.3%	51.6%	16.1%	100.0%
	Receive No Title I Funding	Count	61	122	51	234

	% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	26.1%	52.1%	21.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	191	263	88	542
	% within The following is representative of my current Title I status	35.2%	48.5%	16.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.343[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.539	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.033	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	542		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.03.

Appendix F

Open Ended Survey Statements

As an early college, we receive training from the district, state, and NC New Schools. Our district was one of 40 who tested in the fall semester. My students took two exams per day, and if the data are correct, should be approx. 92% proficient. Growth as not been determined at this time. My school is 42% economically disadvantaged and we target first-generation college students.
Charter - worked closely with regional PD leads
DPI has done a great job of offering and implementing the Core Curriculum
Founding principal of a K-8 Charter school.
I am concerned by the disconnect between the state board of education and the legislature. I believe neither one of them are truly in touch with the students of this state.
I believe that these areas will strengthen with more time and experience, as well as, exposure to CC/ES information. Because support in implementation is moderate due to the change being brand new, more time and understanding is needed to be ranked strong. Also, I am only in my 2nd year as a principal. Not having a lot of experience and coming into this position during a time of major change, I believe I need more support and resources to strengthen. I do not know which region I am in so I left that question blank. I am in Raleigh, NC.
I feel my teachers have received a lot of support and staff development. I would have liked for principals to have received more training at the state level since this was a statewide initiative. It is difficult to evaluate teachers effectively when you have had to get your own training on the CC.
I have been involved on our district level Common Core Team. I have attended numerous trainings on the math curriculum. In addition, I have developed a variety of professional development opportunities for my school and the district. Even though math is m strength, I have made it a goal this year to learn the ELA curriculum because our school improvement goals really focus around reading.
It is hard to receive any training with regard to assessments since no one knows what the CCS final assessments are going to look like.
most training is with Central Office personnel going to training but not much given to school level employees
My concern is that most of the communication and training are only surface level that with reduced manpower and other duties of the principal I am unable to research and apply at the level needed. This is the same for my teaching staff. All the training workshops, meetings, etc. takes them away from their students and planning time. Making teacher's accountable before they have even had time to learn and understand the expectations has increased the anxiety level. District staff members are just as overloaded. One resource that I believe would be helpful at the school level is another administrator to help with the instructional initiative and a teacher leader position (funded by the state) to help drive curriculum and 21st century skills.
My district has contracted with the Leadership and Learning Center to improve my school. It's been extremely helpful in understanding the ELA Common Core standards, using formative assessments, and data driven decision making.

My district has supplied abundant information and training on Common Core. The frustration in the process comes from "changes" in process, information and expectations.
My district has used the five extra days to have countywide PD on Common Core.
None
One of the biggest issues I have had with Common Core is the amount of time my teachers, instructional facilitator, and I have spent in finding appropriate resources to teach the standards with fidelity. We have had to be careful about accepting at face vlue that everything with Common Core in the title is actually aligned.
Overall, I believe my district has done a good job in helping us to plan for and implement the Common Core transition
Problem is lack of definition from DPI. It is difficult to provide direction and answers if there is continuing ambiguity form the State
Teachers and administrators have done a lot of new learning independent of district level support.
The changes feel rushed. Wished we had this year for the in depth training and implement next year.
The information provided by our District has been basically a URL forward. Principals have had little specific training in the Common Core, so my information is from what I can read from DPI and in collegial conversation. I do not think the state has been effective in sending out people to train in the regions. Information is often conflicting and sometimes just wrong. I believe that the best training I have had that assists me in weathering this latest money chase by our state is from PEP and the turnaround process that my school was in when I took the position here. Not that I am all of that, but we have assembled a really good team at my school...smart people who collaborate and do for students first. We have been involved with the Schlechty Center for School Reform (Transformation) and that has also made the biggest difference in how we view this latest punch at public education. There really is not anything wrong with the Common Core. The bad part is the testing associated with it and the selling of North Carolina's soul to Pearson.
The move to the Common Core has been too fast. Principals should have had a training year, then teachers, and then implementation. We are always rushing changes through.
The state and federal government have done little to inform the public of the Common Core and its changes.
We have rec'd little training from the state. As a charter school we began training and implementing common core in 2011

Appendix G

Western Carolina
University
Institutional Review
Board
c/o Office of Research
Administration
109 Camp Building
Cullowhee NC 28723
irb@wcu.edu|
828-227-7212

IRB number: 2013-0155 Date of review: 2/1/2013
Investigators: W. Hoffman & K. Jorissen
Project Title: Principal preparedness to lead the Common Core

Your IRB protocol has been reviewed and determined to be exempt from ongoing IRB monitoring, effective today, under the following category as authorized by 45 CFR 46.101(b):

Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under the previous category, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine public benefit programs.

Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies

Your protocol is not subject to any further IRB monitoring. However, if you wish to make changes to your protocol, including recruitment procedures, sampling, consent, interventions, data collection methods, and investigators, please use the amendment request located on the IRB website (http://www.wcu.edu/6801.asp) to submit your request in advance.

This approval does not cover research conducted prior to the approval date.

IRB representative: Date: 2/1/2013

Appendix H

Dr. Keith Email Correspondence

Keith, Deanna Lyn <dlkeith@liberty.edu>
Sun 7/22/2012 3:24 PM
Inbox

Hi Will,

Sure, no problem. Your research topic is very relevant and will give valuable recommendations for K-12 and higher education institutions. I am currently out of town but will be back in the office later this week. I look forward to talking with you.

Deanna Keith, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor

Director for Special Education

Coordinator for Assessment
School of Education

(434) 582-2417

40 Years of Training Champions for Christ: 1971-2011

mark as unread

Will Hoffman
Wed 7/18/2012 8:58 AM
Sent Items

Dr. Keith,

My name is Will Hoffman and I am currently working on my doctorate through Western Carolina University in North Carolina. David Robinson, a student in your doctoral program, is a friend and colleague here in Madison County Schools. For my study, I would like to survey North Carolina principals and evaluate their perceptions of their preparedness to lead the implementation of the Common Core Standards. I think this is a

relevant topic given the fact that each principal in NC has the same challenge across the state. I would also like to survey superintendents on their perceptions of the level of preparedness of their principals and compare repsonses. This will tie into district office support for principals, and self-efficacy, where I have found a gap in the literature.

I would like to ask permission to replicate your 2008 dissertation study here in North Carolina. I understand that the topic is different, but I think the issue is the same: Are principals prepared to lead the mandates that they are assigned to lead? Do they have adequate PD? Do they hav adequate district support? Is self-efficacy a factor in all of this? I would like to speak with you further about this if you have time to do so.

Thanks!
Will Hoffman

Will Hoffman
Curriculum Director
Madison County Schools
828-649-9276 (234)